

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

# EXECUTIVE BUDGET

FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012



MARK SANFORD  
GOVERNOR

# **The Executive Budget**

## **Fiscal Year 2011-2012**



**January 4, 2011**

*Submitted by*  
**Mark Sanford**  
**Governor**  
**State of South Carolina**

*to the*  
**119<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of South Carolina,**  
**First Session**



# State of South Carolina

## Office of the Governor

MARK SANFORD  
GOVERNOR

PO BOX 12267  
COLUMBIA, SC 29211

January 4, 2011

To the Citizens of South Carolina and the Members of the South Carolina General Assembly:

In the pages that follow is this Administration's Executive Budget for FY 2011-12. Before going into some of the points included in the document, I would once again like to express my thanks to all who gave time, talents and focus to this effort.

Unfortunately, I must begin this letter the same way I have the past two years and point out the obvious – our state is facing a very large budget deficit in FY 2011-12. The worldwide economic crisis, coupled with irresponsible spending by the legislature in times of plenty, has turned a potentially avoidable situation into an incredibly difficult one affecting all South Carolinians. Making an already bad situation worse, nearly \$1 billion in stimulus money that was used to put off tough decisions by patching holes in the budget the last couple of years – which our Administration strongly opposed – will run out this year.

Even though we are still experiencing a slow economy and much attention has been given to the more than \$2 billion cut from the state budget during the past three years, it is important to keep in mind that this year's total budget is expected to be more than \$23 billion. This \$23 billion includes federal funds and state fees and is the highest total budget in South Carolina's history during one of the worst budget years. It is also \$1.3 billion more than last year – a six percent increase. Over the course of this administration, the total state budget will have jumped from around \$15.5 billion in 2003 to \$23.1 billion in 2012 – an increase of 49 percent, or six percent annually. This outpaces the population-plus-inflation by 1.6 percent, annually, on average.

As we've repeatedly said during the last eight years, this spending growth is unsustainable and the state would be wise to change course immediately. The bottom line is that state government will spend more funds than ever in FY 2011-12, but there are mounting challenges that must be addressed.

South Carolina would need to find \$1.3 billion if it were to run state government in FY 2012 as it is currently being operated in FY 2011. Most of this shortfall is due to the fact that South Carolina will not be receiving any more stimulus funds in the coming year. During the last couple of years, the General Assembly has used these stimulus dollars to kick the proverbial can down the road and put off making structural reforms that need to be made to state government in South Carolina. We

are now further down the road and are faced with the billion dollar budget cliff we predicted during the stimulus debate a couple of years ago. The Legislature complicated matters by using stimulus dollars to fund core functions of government in order to delay critical budget decisions for two years. As a recent *New York Times* article from December 4, 2010, points out, while the last couple state budget cycles have been difficult, FY 2012 will be even worse:

The federal stimulus money increased the federal share of state budgets to over a third last year, from just over a quarter in 2008, according to a report issued last week by the National Governors Association and the National Association of State Budget Officers. [...] Scott D. Pattison, the budget association's director, said that for states, next year could be "the worst year of this four- or five-year downturn period."

As we have said in the past, you cannot spend money you do not have and taking on more debt to solve a problem created by too much debt goes beyond the bounds of reason. We cannot expect future generations to foot the bill for the mountains of debt we are accumulating now.

Predictably, some in the Legislature are looking to raise taxes and fees to cover the budget shortfall. Just last year the Legislature overrode our veto and raised the state's cigarette tax without a corresponding tax cut, meaning annually \$115 million more will be spent by the state. The Legislature also attempted to raise court fees to help fund the court system and drivers' license fees to help pay for more State Troopers. Our veto of the court fees legislation was sustained by the House, and we would have vetoed the driver's license fee increase because while we agree with the goals of these proposals – to fund core functions of state government – we do not believe the state should have to raise taxes to do so. As an example, we fully funded both the Judicial branch and increased funding for the Highway Patrol in this Executive Budget.

We are hopeful that the General Assembly resists the urge to increase fees and other taxes in the future –even if the stated reason for the increase is to fund core functions. Raising fees or taxes to fund these types of activities sets a dangerous precedent – using unstable revenue sources to fund core functions of government. Doing this not only increases the financial burden on all South Carolinians, but also leaves agencies unsure of what their funding will be for the next year. Government should not be shielded from making the same hard decisions on costs, and cuts, that businesses and individuals who pay for government have to make. These decisions are tough but, in this kind of economic climate, necessary.

Adequately funding core services of government during this economic downturn made crafting a balanced budget especially difficult, but it can be done without raising taxes or fees.

Keeping these challenges in mind, the following pages lay out this Administration's spending and policy initiatives. From a spending perspective, the FY 2011-12 Executive Budget prioritizes \$5.38 billion in spending by breaking down each activity in government, ranking them to find our most critical and effective services, and then identifying \$265 million in cost saving measures. In funding priorities and making cuts, our budgeting approach is focused on the performance and results of each agency.

Our budget also prepares for what we believe may be several difficult years as state revenue growth idles, or increases only incrementally. For this reason we cannot shield K-12 Education, Higher

Education, and Health from cuts – three functions of government that make up more than 70 percent of the budget, rendering it nearly impossible to make all of the cuts required to put forth a balanced budget out of the remaining 30 percent. Doing so would be harmful to other core government functions such as Public Safety.

Regarding education, students at all levels are provided for by our budget, which replaces more than \$175 million stimulus funds that K-12 education stands to lose in FY 2011-12, appropriates more than \$12 million to First Steps, \$4.8 million to charter schools and \$291 million for scholarships and grants. For health care, we restore funding for the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Social Services, the state employee health plan, and the state's Medicaid Maintenance of Effort. We especially provide funding to Medicaid fraud enforcement – because every \$1 we spend on enforcement, we recoup \$7 in Medicaid costs. To improve public safety, we restore funding to Corrections and keep Juvenile Justice out from under a federal court order, as well as send \$10 million to DPS for increased highway traffic enforcement. We're also putting \$5 million in Commerce's closing fund to help encourage investment and job growth in South Carolina, and fully funding enforcement of the South Carolina Illegal Immigration Reform Act at Labor, Licensing and Regulation with \$2 million in recurring funds. Finally, we are funding the Conservation Bank with \$7.8 million, and also continue to fund a Sunset Commission in order to eliminate archaic and oftentimes expensive laws that no longer serve their original purpose.

From a policy perspective, we would like to see the following ideas implemented: spending caps, state government restructuring and tax reform.

First, we continue to believe that government spending should not grow faster than the underlying economy. Prior to mid-year reductions in FY 2008-09, South Carolina government grew more than 40 percent between 2004 and 2008, leading the Southeast in year-to-year government growth. During the last three years, the same budget has been cut by 28 percent. This constant ebb and flow of state spending results in overspending during years with surplus revenues, leaving no savings for years when there is not enough general funds.

If spending were capped at population-plus-inflation, the rollercoaster spending would be flattened out and a surplus would be available for the years when it was needed. Overspending in the good years and drastic cuts in the bad years do not show a genuine concern for the taxpayers' well-being or money.

Second, restructuring South Carolina's fractured state government would make it more efficient and effective. We have proposed a series measures during the last eight years that would go a long way to making our government work better for the people of this state. According to *Governing* magazine, South Carolina government has 234 employees per 10,000 residents – 35 percent higher than the U.S. average of 174. The duplication in state services these numbers suggest has much to do with why government costs South Carolinians 40 percent more than the national average.

Third, in order for South Carolina to improve its business climate it has to get away from our piecemeal approach to economic development that selectively provides tax incentives to some businesses but not to others. We believe a better approach is to simply broaden the tax base while lowering marginal rates so that we are not only giving companies a good deal when they decide to locate here but also a reason to stay and expand.

To this end, based on research done by the Department of Commerce, we are recommending a comprehensive tax reform proposal to spur job creation and capital investment by creating a revenue-neutral optimal tax structure that broadens the tax base and lowers marginal tax rates – laying the foundation for greater economic growth. By eliminating deductions and closing tax loopholes, we believe the state could set tax rates roughly as follows:

- Property tax rate of 4 percent
- Consumption tax on goods and services at 2 percent to 3 percent
- Flat personal income tax at 2 percent to 3 percent
- Flat corporate income tax in the range of 2 percent to 3 percent

I look forward to seeing these reforms and many more adopted in the following years.

Mark Sanford

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
The Budgeting for Results Process.....	18
Revenue.....	30
Run a Fiscally Disciplined Government.....	36
Modernize Government.....	44
Innovate Education.....	62
Emphasize Economic Development.....	85
Meet the Health Care Challenge.....	94

### Goal Areas:

1. Improve K-12 Student Performance.....	107
2. Improve Our Higher Education System and Cultural Resources.....	118
3. Improve the Conditions for Economic Growth.....	136
4. Improve the Health and Protections of Our Children and Adults.....	146
5. Improve the Quality of Natural Resources.....	161
6. Improve the Safety of People and Property.....	167
7. Improve the Efficiencies and Effectiveness of Central State Government Support and Other Governmental Services.....	185

### Appendices:

Revenue and Allocation Summary.....	A
Executive Budget Purchase Plan.....	B
New Funding – Cost Savings Overview Document.....	B1
Summary of FY 2008-09 Executive Budget Approvals and Cost Savings.....	B2
Executive Budget Purchase Plan by Goal Area.....	B3
Executive Budget Purchase Plan by Agency.....	B4
Executive Budget Savings Plan.....	C
Educational Lottery Budget.....	D
EIA Budget.....	E

# Executive Summary



## Executive Summary

Regrettably, many of the budgetary cuts we make in the FY 2011-12 Executive Budget we would not have normally made, but are now *forced* to make because the majority in the Legislature chose not to follow the recommendations we set forth in the seven previous executive budgets. These budgets provided a blueprint to build a stronger financial foundation by limiting spending growth, reorganizing our inefficient and unaccountable structure and using results-based budgeting practices. When economic times were good, our calls for fiscal restraint were roundly ignored. In the hope that crisis creates opportunity, we renew our call once again to adopt a course of sustainable spending rather than go through these tough and damaging cuts as revenue grows and falls.

### Objectives

The current economic situation at both a national and state level presents us with the difficult task of meeting the increased demand for government services with decreased funding sources. Our first goal is to present to the General Assembly a balanced state budget that does not raise taxes and funds essential services for South Carolinians in the priority areas of education, health care and social services, economic development, public safety, and natural resources. This budget also provides us a chance to highlight several policy changes we recommend the state achieve in the near future.

South Carolina families currently face economic times more challenging than any in recent memory. The collapse of the credit, housing, and stock markets, and the belt-tightening in government budgets at the state and local level diminishes the extent to which government is able to serve citizens. Accordingly, we have prioritized our spending by making painful cuts, but we also have a unique opportunity to fundamentally change the way we budget taxpayer money.


### Administration Goals

To improve South Carolina's competitive advantage globally and ensure that government spending does not grow at an unsustainable level, the administration has laid out seven major budget goals for the FY 2011-12 Executive Budget. Adhering to these goals, we have prioritized and funded the state's critical needs, while keeping the taxpayers' best interest in mind and retaining the fiscal discipline demanded by organizations such as national bond rating companies. Our seven goals for the FY 2011-12 Executive Budget are as follows:

1. **Limit the annual growth of general fund spending by not exceeding population growth plus the rate of inflation.** This administration believes in the fundamental idea that government should not grow faster than the taxpayer's ability to sustain it over time. We believe a spending cap would have better controlled government spending that grew by more than 40 percent from FY 2003-04 through FY 2007-08, a rate many times faster than the growth of the underlying economy. As evidenced by the painful spending cuts we are now making, it should be very clear that we cannot grow government faster than people's ability to pay for it.

## Peaks and Valleys Approach to State Spending

(recurring and non-recurring dollars, in millions)




To that end, we are calling for legislation to limit spending increases to the growth in the state's population plus inflation. Senator Tom Davis and Representative Garry Smith have filed bills that would do just that, and we hope other legislators will follow their lead.


## State Government Growth Under Population Plus Inflation Spending Cap

FY2005 - FY2010

(in millions)




It is important to point out that, in the years leading up to the economic downturn, there were excess funds over the population-plus-inflation cap.



Instead of using these funds to grow the size of government, these funds should have gone into a long-term rainy day fund, toward paying down the state's unfunded liabilities, or sent directly back to the taxpayers – the best economic stimulus of all. Unfortunately, our argument for fiscal prudence was met with silence or ridicule from some powerful players in the budgeting process. The legislative budget writers' failure to respond to our calls for fiscal discipline has created an unstable financial condition for our state that demands that we change the way we budget the taxpayers' money. Accordingly, we believe that we need to capitalize on the current economic challenges and finally institute some common-sense budgeting principles that will go a long way toward making state government spending more sustainable in the future.

2. **Limit annualizations to one percent of revenue.** To put our state's fiscal house in order, we must stop the practice of annualizations – using one-time money to fund recurring needs. Annualizations represent borrowing from Peter to pay Paul and, ultimately, only serve to delay tough decisions by putting off budget pain for another year. The annualizations for FY 2010-11 are unusually high – \$1.274 billion – primarily because of the federal stimulus money. However, even in the relatively normal years prior to receiving the stimulus funds, annualizations nearly doubled from FY 2006-07 to FY 2008-09. Our proposal is modeled on the Florida Constitution that limits annualizations to three percent of revenue, requiring a three-fifths vote of both Houses to exceed that limit.



We believe there needs to be a limit on annualization spending, which is why we continue to ask that annualizations not exceed one percent of total estimated revenue for a fiscal year.

3. **Expand economic freedom.** There has never been a more important time to discuss how best to grow our state's economy. We believe staying competitive amid today's challenges requires two things. First, a broader tax base with lower marginal rates would represent a significant step toward making our state more attractive to businesses. After a comprehensive review, the Department of Commerce finds that South Carolina's tax code is becoming narrower and more targeted, providing government-conferred advantages on some at the expense of others. The consequences of this development are not benign; Commerce found that this tax structure distorts economic decision-making and hampers economic growth.

Second, we have to get away from our piecemeal approach to economic development that selectively provides tax incentives to some businesses but not to others. We believe a better approach is to simply broaden the tax base while lowering marginal rates so that we are not only giving companies a good deal when they decide to locate here, but also a reason to stay and expand. Our proposal avoids the unintended consequence that comes with much of today's incentives system, wherein we create incentives for businesses coming into our state, but have no incentives for small and mid-size businesses already in our state.

To this end, based on Commerce's findings, we are recommending a comprehensive tax reform proposal to spur job creation and capital investment. The plan is as follows:

- Create a revenue-neutral optimal tax structure that broadens the tax base and lowers marginal tax rates – laying the foundation for greater economic growth. By eliminating deductions and closing tax loopholes, we could set tax rates roughly as follows:
    - Property tax rate of 4 percent
    - Consumption tax on goods and services at 2 percent to 3 percent
    - Flat personal income tax at 2 percent to 3 percent
    - Flat corporate income tax in the range of 2 percent to 3 percent
4. **Appropriate funds based on a rational assessment, from the citizen's perspective, of the relative importance of the government's activities.** To prioritize and then provide for the core needs of the state, we utilized the Budgeting for Results process that we established during FY 2005-06. In preparing our executive budget this year, we relied on past budget discussions, open to the public and the press, with directors of state agencies throughout South Carolina to discuss better and more efficient ways to achieve our state's budgetary goals.

This year, preparing the executive budget presented a difficult challenge due to the dramatic and unprecedented drop in revenue. Many cost savings were found and many tough choices were made to ensure that our state's essential services were adequately funded.

Through these actions, our proposed budget recommends roughly **\$265 million in specific general fund savings** to the taxpayers through operational efficiencies realized by state agencies and by not purchasing lower priority activities.

We also recommend purchasing higher priority activities in the areas of education, health care and social services, economic development, public safety, and natural resources as follows.

- a) **K-12 Education – \$1.96 Billion General Funds/\$3.5 Billion Total Funds** – To provide for the state's K-12 needs during FY 2011-12, we annualized roughly \$175 million in stimulus funds that K-12 received in the FY 2010-11 Appropriations Act, as well as other one-time funding for transportation costs related to the state's bus fleet. Additionally, we once again propose giving local school districts the flexibility they need to put education dollars in the classroom by restoring funding for the base student cost to \$1,946 – compared to \$1,630 in FY 2010-11. However, we once again propose that teachers' salaries should reflect classroom results or teachers' willingness to teach core subjects in critical needs areas – not simply on teachers' seniority. In this budget, K-12 represents 36.5 percent of general fund spending. A key function of the K-12 educational system is to prepare students for college, work, and life. Unfortunately, the quality of education that many of our students receive is far from what will prepare them for life in today's ever-changing global economy. To better

prepare our students, we have established five goals that can be achieved through the activities we purchase in our budget: increase the high school completion rate; increase participation and achievement in rigorous courses; raise the national performance ranking of South Carolina's students on the SAT, ACT and NAEP; eliminate the achievement gap; and improve the efficiency with which education dollars are spent.

To achieve these goals, we propose supporting the following activities:

- Restoring funding to the base student cost: \$1,946.
  - \$175 million recurring funds to replace lost stimulus funds.
  - Concur with the EOC's previous proposal to preserve average teacher salaries at \$47,376, while rewarding performance and willingness to teach core subjects in critical needs areas.
  - Funding Education and Economic Development Act obligations to provide our students with the tools they need to choose a career path that will prepare them for today's competitive world: \$30.59 million.
  - Funding Student Health and Fitness Act obligations: \$27 million.
  - Providing South Carolina's "Below Average" and "Unsatisfactory" schools the flexibility to pursue innovative programs that will help them overcome the obstacles that have limited their success.
  - Offering school choice to students in chronically underperforming schools. We agree with the Education Oversight Committee's previous recommendation that students in underperforming schools should be able to attend another school of their choice. This model requires no additional funding, as the EOC proposes that state per-pupil funding follows the child to the school they choose to attend. This also supports our goal of driving dollars directly to where they are needed most: the classroom.
  - Expanding public school choice options for students by increasing funding for the South Carolina Public Charter School District infrastructure and virtual curriculum development: \$1.5 million.
  - Funding for 4K Child Development Education Pilot Program: \$12 million.
  - Funding school bus operations: \$110.8 million.
  - Funding the National Board Certification program, but capping enrollment on July 1, 2011: \$65 million.
- b) **Higher Education and Cultural Resources – \$499 Million General Funds / \$4.39 Billion Total Funds** – Our primary goal for higher education is to provide a high quality education at an affordable price. Achieving these goals will be challenging given the fragmented system of 33 public colleges and universities that operate independently with little coordination and oversight. Our current economic downturn has added to these challenges, as recognized by our low college-affordability ranking by the National Center for Public Policy

and Higher Education. Having a postsecondary program serves little purpose if our students cannot afford to participate.

While it's true that state funding has decreased, tuition at most of the state's colleges and universities has increased at a much faster rate. We believe accessibility and affordability of our higher education system should be a priority in our executive budget, which is why we are providing full funding (including increases of \$54 million) for our various scholarship programs as follows:

- **Needs-based scholarships** for total funding of \$23.6 million.
- **LIFE Scholarships** for total funding of \$179.8 million.
- **HOPE Scholarships** for total funding of \$8.5 million
- **Palmetto Fellows Scholarships** for total funding of \$54.3 million.

- c) **Health Care and Protections of Children and Adults – \$1.53 Billion General Funds / \$11.07 Billion Total Funds** – Nationally, the costs associated with health care continue to increase faster than the rate of inflation. Medical expenses, according to the 2009 “State of the States” report, account for 17.3 percent of the country’s gross domestic product, compared to 7.2 percent in 1970. In preparing this budget, one of the biggest challenges we face is dealing with the rising cost of all aspects of health care as it greatly impacts the quality of life. Overall, health care costs account for more than a third of the state budget. In fact, our state’s largest health care expenditure is our state's Medicaid program – which has an enrollment of about 795,000 citizens. However, due to the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), an additional 500,000 citizens will be added to the Medicaid rolls – meaning approximately 30 percent of South Carolina's total population will be enrolled in the Medicaid program in the next ten years. This expansion will require over \$500 million in additional state funds in the next five years, and will cost S.C. an estimated \$4.8 billion in new state funds by 2024.

One of our primary goals is to meet Medicaid’s maintenance of effort requirements for core health benefits to our most vulnerable citizens, however modifications to the state Medicaid program are necessary. We also need to continue preventing and treating substance abuse. Because of the prevalence of smoking in our state – more than 20 percent of South Carolinians smoke – we need to keep our focus on chronic disease prevention. With that in mind, we remain concerned that South Carolina ranks 8<sup>th</sup> in adult obesity, 18<sup>th</sup> in heart disease, and 1<sup>st</sup> in the stroke death rate. Moreover, in 2009, 16.1 percent of our population lacked health insurance. With such serious health concerns, during FY 2011-12, we propose health care spending as a percentage of the total budget at 43.2 percent. Specifically, to provide support for the state’s health care and protections of children and adults during FY 2011-12, we propose:



- Paying down the deficit at the Department of Health and Human Services created by rapid program growth and a lack of either adequate funding or flexibility to manage program from the General Assembly: \$228 million.
- Paying down the deficit at the Department of Social Services created by increased caseloads and lost federal funding: \$28.8 million
- Meeting Medicaid's maintenance of effort requirements for core health care benefits for the poor, elderly, and persons with disabilities through the Department of Health and Human Services: \$553.85 million.
- Continuing our focus on chronic disease prevention at the Department of Health and Environmental Control: \$1.03 million.
- Continuing development of the Child Support Enforcement System at the Department of Social Services: \$3.9 million.
- Continuing our focus on economic development by funding the Closing Fund at the Department of Commerce: \$5 million.

d) **Economic Development – \$74.49 Million General Funds / \$1.79 Billion**

**Total Funds** – As South Carolina faces persistent competition from around the world, we continue to succeed in attracting new business and encouraging existing businesses to grow and be competitive in an ever-changing marketplace. Our administration and the Department of Commerce have already laid much of this groundwork. As a case in point, Commerce has completed 1,000 economic development projects, which created more than 101,000 jobs and \$20.145 billion in new capital investment during the last eight years. Nevertheless, with a rapidly changing world, there is always room for improvement. Specifically, to assist with the state's economic development during FY 2011-12, we propose:

- Broadening the tax base by eliminating carve outs and deductions and lowering overall tax rates in a revenue-neutral manner. By eliminating loopholes and tax deductions, we can cut the property tax rate to 4 percent; cut the sales tax to roughly 2 percent to 3 percent; cut the income tax down to roughly 2 percent to 3 percent; and cut the corporate income tax down to roughly 2 percent to 3 percent.
- Funding Local Workforce Investment: \$44.7 million.
- Exploring with the Department of Transportation all opportunities regarding the creation of public-private partnerships for the building, operation, and maintenance of our highways – including I-73 in Horry County.

e) **Public Safety – \$541 Million General Funds / \$1.09 Billion Total Funds** –

Our administration has made “quality of life” in South Carolina a priority. South Carolina provides a unique look and feel that most other states and countries cannot provide. At a fundamental level, however, no factor is more important



when discussing quality of life than the ability of citizens to live free from crime and unnecessarily harsh results of natural or man-made disasters. We are fortunate to have such committed personnel working in our public safety agencies and during the past eight years their commitment to making South Carolina safer has improved the quality of life found here. Despite these efforts, South Carolina continues to face some challenges in the area of public safety.

Specifically, to assist with the state's public safety needs during FY 2011-12, we propose supporting the following activities:

- **Paying down the deficit at the Department of Corrections created, once again, by a lack of adequate funding by the General Assembly: \$7.5 million.**
- **Funding the Department of Public Safety, allowing Highway Patrol officers to provide greater highway traffic enforcement and to further reduce the response times to collisions: \$71.37 million.**
- **Maintaining funding for the state's seven high-security, eight medium-security, eleven minimum-security, and three female institutions: \$343.5 million.**
- **Fully funding the sentencing reform legislation and maintaining funding for community supervision of almost 50,000 adult jurisdictional offenders: \$20.4 million.**

- f) **Natural Resources – \$34.3 Million General Funds / \$174 Million Total Funds** – South Carolina is blessed with beautiful expanses of timberland and shoreline teeming with wildlife. With this blessing comes the considerable responsibility of preserving our natural resources. We must be careful to ensure that short-term gain does not overcome our state's long-term goals. Although we recognize that our current budgetary circumstances will limit our conservation efforts during the next year, we plan to use our best efforts to safeguard South Carolina's natural beauty.

To provide for the state's natural resource needs during FY 2011-12, we recommend funding for the following activities:

- **Preserving historic sites and natural resources by funding the Conservation Bank: \$7.8 million.**
- **Monitoring and preserving South Carolina's marine resources: \$1.6 million.**
- **Protecting and managing water resources: \$10.93 million.**

- g) **Improve Central State Government Support – \$541 Million General Funds/\$1.09 Billion Total Funds** – This administration continues to push for policies that will provide an efficient and effective government that maximizes value to the taxpayers. In this section of the budget, we will look at ways to improve the structures and policies of central state government and other

governmental services in an effort to propose ways that might make them operate more efficiently and effectively. To this end, we propose that the General Assembly adopt the Government Efficiency and Accountability Review (GEAR) Committee recommendations which will reduce cost, increase accountability, improve services, reduce duplication, and allow South Carolina to become more competitive in a world economy. To date, only 16 out of the 61 of the GEAR Committee's recommendations have been adopted, which means that the General Assembly has ample opportunity to obtain cost savings without cutting essential governmental services by adopting the remainder of the recommendations. Given the dramatic downturn in the economy and the state's fiscal condition, it is time the General Assembly gives proper consideration to all of these recommendations. The following are some of our past recommendations that we continue to include in this budget:

- **Moving to nightly custodial services – savings of \$1 million.**
- **Incentivizing health plan participants to use clinically equivalent generic or plan-preferred drugs – savings of \$5.3 million.**
- **Creating a Central State Travel Division within the Comptroller General's Office to manage and monitor agency travel – savings of \$5.97 million.**

In addition, we use this section to explore new ideas for reducing costs in central state government. Some of the new recommendations to reduce waste and increase efficiency in central state government include:

- **Implementing efficient cell phone, pager, and satellite phone policies – savings of \$751,410.**
- **Reducing insurance premiums paid to the Insurance Reserve Fund – savings of \$3.74 million.**
- **Eliminating vendor preferences in the procurement code – savings of \$150,000.**

5. **Decrease the size of state government by consolidating agencies, boards, and commissions and strengthening the cabinet form of government.** Government in South Carolina costs 140 percent the national average, and given the budget challenges our state faces today and in the future, we can simply no longer afford our inefficient, unaccountable government structure.

The administration has been committed to continuing Governor Carroll Campbell's legacy by further restructuring state government to increase accountability and reduce duplication and waste. Our state government today is still largely fractured and duplicative, wasting dollars that would otherwise go to fund other activities or back to the citizens of our state. Many agencies are run by boards and commissions comprised of well-intended people who give their time, typically for little or no pay. While we are grateful that citizens are willing to give their time to serve the people of this state, these people also have families and careers that keep them away from the daily operations of

state government. We believe that the cabinet form of government, rather than boards and commissions, will significantly increase government efficiency and effectiveness because those charged with managing cabinet agencies report directly to the governor – who is directly accountable to all voters in the state.

The need for more accountability has hardly been more evident than in the past couple of years. Three different reports – one on the Department of Transportation (DOT) from the Legislative Audit Council (LAC), one on the Employment Security Commission (ESC) from the LAC and the other on the Budget and Control Board from the GEAR Committee – have highlighted the areas for improvement. Fortunately, the efforts of this administration and others led to the DOT becoming a part of our cabinet, and last spring the ESC was merged into a new cabinet agency called the Department of Employment and Workforce (DEW). The Budget and Control Board, however, remains a part of our government system and is still the only one of its kind in the entire country.

In previous years, some legislators have support the creation of a Department of Administration. Bills to accomplish this have been filed in both the House and Senate and we believe this should be one of the first orders of business in 2011. We would also ask the members of the General Assembly to advance the restructuring proposals in our executive budget including streamlining health care agencies.

These restructuring proposals, when taken in total, will allow us to eliminate or merge duplicative state offices, departments, agencies, boards, or commissions. In doing this, the state will realize **restructuring savings of about \$16 million during FY 2011-12.**

6. **Honor the promises and obligations of prior years.** Our retirement system's last reported unfunded liability as of the end of October 2010 was nearly \$12 billion. However, this number is only a part of the picture because it does not include \$9.3 billion of unfunded Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) costs for retirees' health care. The combined \$21 billion in unfunded liabilities is a key reason that this administration was against the proposal last year to double the guaranteed cost-of-living increase for retirees, which added billions more in costs to the system.

Unfortunately, the \$21 billion figure has gotten substantially worse during the past four years. We were unsuccessful in our efforts to prevent the Budget and Control Board from adopting Treasurer Chellis' 2008 plan to assume a higher rate of return for our state's investment portfolio to eight percent. We continue to believe these assumptions are wildly optimistic (as even the State Retirement Investment Commission agree), especially in light of all of the uncertainty in the economy. Indeed, over the last three years, the total portfolio is down 3.41 percent, according to the S.C. Retirement System Investment Commission.

South Carolina's retirement system is underfunded, much like several other public pension systems across the United States. In his annual letter to shareholders, America's most famed investor Warren Buffett wrote four years ago that public pension "funding is woefully inadequate" and that "problems will only become apparent long after" public

officials who made the promises have left office. He goes on to write that “promises involving...generous cost-of-living adjustments are easy for these officials to make...those promises will be anything but easy to keep.” To increase our system’s solvency, we must make long overdue changes now to lessen the potential of severe future pain for both taxpayers and retirees.

The GEAR Report made the following common-sense recommendations for non-vested employees to shore up finances of the retirement systems:

- Base retirement income on the salary from the last five years of employment rather than the last three years.
- Discontinue the practice of applying unused vacation pay to the number before calculating retirement pay.
- Eliminate the TERI program for new state employees.
- Discontinue the practice of applying unused sick leave to the length of service.
- Move back to a requirement of 30 years of service for full retirement (as is the standard in most states) as opposed to the reduced 28 year requirement adopted by the legislature earlier this decade.

We support all of these proposals, but we must go further in order to begin addressing our tens of billions in debt and keep our state’s high credit rating. One way to do so is to ask retirees to start paying a larger percentage of their health care costs. Agencies (and thus taxpayers) have traditionally paid the same cost-share for health care for retirees as current state employees. Currently, taxpayers are paying approximately 72 percent of the health care costs for retirees and their families. During the past 10 years, taxpayers have picked up between 67-82 percent of that cost with retirees paying the other 20-30 percent of the health care tab.

For example, in FY 2011-12, retiree’s total health cost is projected to be near \$483 million, which means that taxpayers will be paying more than \$343 million this year for retiree’s health care. This charge is paid through a surcharge on agencies’ payrolls. That charge is increasing rapidly – from less than two percent of an agency’s payroll in 1999 to 3.9 percent in the current budget year – a more than 95 percent increase in the past decade.

A report issued in 2000 by the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce showed that our state’s retirement system was more generous than 90 percent of the major government pension systems in the country. Since that time, the Legislature has even increased those benefits by guaranteeing a two percent annual cost of living increase for retirees. Unfortunately South Carolina is still a relatively poor state, ranking 47<sup>th</sup> in per-capita personal income, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. How can relatively low-income taxpayers afford to pay top-level benefits to public retirees? And will the tens of billions required to do so come from substantially higher taxes or from cutting funding to other worthwhile government programs?

In fact, at one time, the president of the South Carolina State Employees Association wrote the following about how benefits have been obtained (emphasis added) on the association web site:

*[D]emonstrations of our numerical strength have yielded retirement benefits second to none, a TERI program, 28 year retirement, pay raises and cost-of-living increases. None of these benefits came automatically. It is through the efforts of a united front of state employees and retirees, advocating for ourselves and others, who are not members, that all of these benefits accrued to us.*


The reality is that benefits accruing to government retirees have to come from somewhere – in this case, current taxpayers. However, the tens of billions in unfunded future benefits – political promises that have been made but not funded – will either have to come from our children and grandchildren or the entire system will collapse under the weight of its debt. Most taxpayers in South Carolina cannot afford retirement benefits “second-to-none” for themselves, much less for hundreds of thousands of public retirees.

A continued failure to start funding our long-term liabilities and shore up the solvency of our retirement systems will threaten the financial well-being of every South Carolinian – especially state retirees. But these proposals are also made in an effort to decrease a legacy of huge debt with which we are on the verge of burdening our children and grandchildren.


7. **Fund property tax relief** – Since 1995, the state has returned billions in property tax relief to the people of South Carolina. Four sessions ago, the General Assembly passed legislation which offers even more property tax relief by shifting K-12 Education funding responsibility from owner-occupied homeowners to the general populace in the form of a sales tax increase. While we feel that it is important to highlight the tax shift nature of this bill, we nevertheless agreed with and signed this landmark property tax bill since we feel that the burden of being a homeowner within the state has become too great for some of our fellow citizens. **In this budget, we set aside \$105.8 million for FY 2011-12 in payments back to local governments for property tax relief** – in addition to the funding mechanism to continue complete elimination of the school operating portion of property taxes.

Summary Comparison of General Fund Expenditures

Current Budget – FY 2010-11 General Fund Expenditures




Governor's Purchase Plan – FY 2011-12 General Fund Expenditures




Summary Comparison of Total Fund Expenditures

Current Budget – FY 2010-11 Total Fund Expenditures



Category	Dollars in Millions
- Health & Protection Services	9,454.0
- Higher Ed. & Cultural Resources	4,412.4
- K-12 Education	3,558.9
- Economic Development	1,989.4
- Public Safety	914.8
- Central State Government /Other Governmental Services	1,064.4
- Natural Resources	205.0
- Debt Service	210.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,809</b>

Governor's Purchase Plan – FY 2011-12 Total Fund Expenditures



Category	Dollars in Millions
- Health & Protection Services	11,072.6
- K-12 Education	3,502.4
- Higher Ed. & Cultural Resources	4,389.3
- Economic Development	1,792.4
- Public Safety	886.8
- Central State Government /Other Governmental Services	1,096.9
- Natural Resources	174.0
- Debt Service	199.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23,114</b>



## \$23.11 Billion

Includes all funding such as the General Fund, Other & Federal Funds, Capital Reserve Fund, Surplus, Contingency Reserve Fund, EIA, Lottery, other Revenue Adjustments

Higher Priorities

Lower Priorities

### What our plan buys:

\$11.07 billion	Health care and protection for nearly a million children and adults
\$3.5 billion	K-12 education for almost 700,000 students
\$4.39 billion	Higher education for more than 200,204 students & funding for cultural resources
\$1.79 billion	Economic development
\$886 million	Public safety
\$1.09 billion	Central state government/other governmental services
\$174 million	Protection of our natural resources
\$264.3 million	Funding for deficits at Department of Corrections, Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Social Services

**\$23.11 billion TOTAL**

## \$265 Million General Funds

### Examples of what our plan does not buy:

\$82.8 million	Agency activities that are duplicative of other state programs, or are low priorities
\$34.6 million	A fragmented system at the state's higher education institutions
\$5.69 million	TERI employees leaving state government
\$6.57 million	Excess Agency Travel
\$1.0 million	Daily custodial services
\$983,133	Free DPS traffic control at special events
\$360,000	Excess vehicle maintenance facilities in the Columbia area
\$1.37 million	Piecemeal approach to economic development
\$2.78 million	State-funded lobbyists

**\$265 million TOTAL**



**Additional Information**

More details of agency activities can be found at the Office of State Budget's website at <http://www.budget.sc.gov/OSB-agency-activity.phtm>. Further specific highlights of the Governor's Purchasing Plan for each goal area can be found later in this document starting with Improving K-12 Student Performance on page 107. The Governor's complete Purchasing Plan can be found in Appendix B; and the complete Savings Proposals can be found in Appendix C.

# The Budgeting for Results Process

## The Budgeting for Results Process

**Results matter...or at least they should. Especially when it comes to tax dollars and public expenditures. Increasingly, taxpayers are demanding results and performance in return for their hard earned dollars.**

– Geoffrey F. Segal, Reason Foundation (2004)

**Most managers have no idea what their products and services really cost. At best, conventional cost accounting is marginally relevant to decisions about operations and management. At worst, it distorts reality and causes dysfunctional decisions.**

– Kehoe, et al., *Activity-Based Management in Government* (1995)

This is our seventh executive budget using an “activity-based” approach that emphasizes outcomes or results. This approach requires agencies to break state government programs and processes down into literally hundreds of separate and distinct activities. We then establish key goals for the state to accomplish in major functional areas of government, such as education, public safety, and economic development. Next, we carefully select sound and verifiable indicators of success from reliable sources to measure both short- and long-term progress. Finally, we identify strategies that are considered “best practices” or scientific evidence and documentation to bring about real, proven, significant, and lasting results.

Hence, this intensive activity-based budget method provides decision makers – our administration, legislators, public officials, and administrators – with valuable and important information and data. These detailed cost data are significant because they give decision makers the opportunity to make optimal choices about how to allocate limited resources. Moreover, activity-based data permit decision makers to streamline, reengineer, and innovate state agency operations and processes to produce the maximum results at the best cost.

Further, without activity-based data, it is difficult or nearly impossible to answer such questions as:

- Is this state governmental service or activity of good value? Is it both cost-efficient and cost-effective?
- Are the costs associated with this activity competitive? In other words, can this activity be provided more cheaply by competing service providers (public or private)?
- More importantly, is this activity even desirable to or needed by the public?

Additionally, at this juncture, it is equally important to comment that many experts in public finance believe that the cardinal aim of activity-based budgeting is accountability. Performance information and data used in budgeting holds public officials, especially program managers, accountable for

service quality, cost-efficiency, and program effectiveness. The focus of activity-based budgeting is, once again, on results, not simply inputs. For this reason, governors, legislators, service or program recipients, and the public generally can determine accountability with a degree of certainty through the use of activity-based methods, whereas this is not possible utilizing traditional or line-item approaches. This ability to assess performance and hold public managers and administrators accountable serves as a powerful incentive to improve quality.

As pointed out in previous budgets, our executive budget is a vast departure from the traditional state budgeting practices of the past – which unfortunately continue to be used today by the state’s Legislature. As such, budget or financial analysis utilized in the legislative spending process is unavoidably limited or incomplete.

By the standards of today’s financial practices, traditional governmental budget processes are by and large considered to be archaic, marginal and void of careful analysis and decision making as they relate to the preceding year’s “appropriation’s base.” Their focus is on “new monies” alone – that is, on those funds that result from revenue growth during the previous year.

This incremental approach allows obviously for only a narrow, minor discretionary review of state spending. Thus, public policy is made in incremental or successive steps, resting on decisions made in prior years. Unfortunately, incrementalism does little more than *control* spending and *preserve* the status quo of the bureaucracy. Worse still, past spending decisions simply are unexamined. These “automatic” determinations – without consideration of the twin critical aims of (1) establishing cost savings and (2) effectively formulating and discerning productive results – prove to be counterproductive and often simply wasteful.

### Traditional Budgeting vs. Budgeting for Results

<b>Incremental or Traditional Budgeting</b>	<b>Results-Based Budgeting</b>
Focus is on the allocation of “new monies” only (5-10 percent of budget total)	Focus is on nearly all monies or the entire budget amount (excepting certain obligations such as debt service, reserve fund requirements, etc.)
Concentration is on inputs (what you buy), e.g., “objects of expenditure”	Concentration is on outputs (expected results)
Narrow or marginal decision making	Comprehensive or enterprise-wide decision making
Subjective based	Objective based
Preserving the status quo	Determining new, creative approaches to problems and needs
Agency or bureaucracy driven	Outcome driven
Promotes restraints, restrictions and red tape	Encourages flexibility and ingenuity
Control orientation	Planning and management orientation
Emphasizes compliance and preserving legality	Emphasizes performance and innovation
Stresses audit trails and conformity	Stresses program evaluation and improvement
Involves agency heads, elected officials and advocacy groups	Involves everyone wanting to participate, especially those wearing a “citizen’s hat”
Encourages and perpetuates single-agency programs	Encourages intra- and interagency cooperation among programs and activities

Our administration utilizes what experts have described as a pioneering budget process that examines the entire budget – virtually every activity performed by government and its associated funding. Again, this is done ultimately in the context of a set of pre-established goals or results

determined by our administration to be of major significance to the citizenry. Called “Budgeting for Results” (BFR), it is a process that includes input or direct participation from ordinary citizens and subject-matter experts, designated as Result Teams, which develop purchase strategies to achieve the preset goals. Using these so-called “purchase strategies,” the Result Teams prioritize all state governmental activities, looking for possible cost savings, consolidations, and process improvements. Although we did not utilize Result Teams this year, their past specific indicators, strategies, priorities, and innovations have been considered and this extensive information became a blueprint for our FY 2011-12 budget.

Definition of Terms
<b>Goal Areas</b> – Seven broad result or priority areas that the administration believes South Carolinians want most from their state government.
<b>Indicators</b> – Key measures or indices that provide the best evidence to the citizen that a statewide goal area is being achieved.
<b>Strategies</b> – Proven or promising approaches, influences, or factors for achieving goals or results.
<b>Activities</b> – Individual or discrete actions taken by state government to accomplish goals and objectives. For the citizen, “What is the state doing, for whom, and does this accomplish something that is both valuable and needed?” “Precisely, why are we doing it?” “And at what cost?”

We believe that our budgeting approach is detailed, transparent, and rational. Overall, its focus is toward bringing about positive short- and long-term consequences. In effect, the purpose of BFR and our executive budget for FY 2011-12 is:

To build and present a coherent, comprehensive spending plan for South Carolina based on clearly articulated statewide goals, effective strategies, and creative and insightful thinking. To focus on the “keeps,” not the cuts. To underscore “results” to ensure that citizens – not agencies, special interest groups, or lobbyists – get their full money’s worth from state government.

We adopted the BFR process because of its logical approach to public budgeting and fiscal decision making. BFR was originally based on Washington State’s budget process model which was established in the fall of 2002. It is a process, in a modified form, which has been adopted by several states like Iowa and Michigan and local governments like Los Angeles and Dallas.

As we remarked last year, the BFR process examines the entirety of government and nearly all statewide funding. Our priorities are clear. This budget demonstrates how we will live within our means and invest in what matters by honing in on core goals and directing the whole of state government and its funding structure toward meeting those goals. It is our roadmap to a results-producing government that serves South Carolina’s needs.


## The Budgeting for Results Organizational Structure

A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both.

– James Madison, *The Writings of James Madison* 103 (1910)

The principal structural components of BFR are units or “teams.” These organizational units consist of (1) a Guidance Team, (2) a Review Team, and (3) seven Results Teams.

### Budgeting for Results Structure



1. **The Guidance Team (GT)** predominantly planned, supported, and monitored the BFR process. The GT consisted of our staff and staff of the Office of State Budget (OSB). The GT also actively worked to energize the BFR process and met to coordinate and maintain the efforts of the seven Results Teams.
2. **The Review Team (TRT)** was designed to review and assess each agency’s detailed activities before the activities were submitted to the Results Teams. The TRT further ensured that activities were properly defined or explained and formatted. Also, they placed activities into the appropriate, logical goal areas. Staffing consisted of personnel from the OSB and the Governor’s Office. It should be acknowledged that each of these staff members possessed extensive knowledge of the agency budgets within the various goal areas.
3. **The Results Teams (RT)** have been an integral part of the entire BFR process – in terms of sheer work and productivity. These seven teams were made up of groups of typically five to seven persons who possessed some expertise in relevant subject matter but were asked to think like citizens, setting aside any agency or advocacy bias. Their chief roles and responsibilities were to identify those indicators that would best show progress toward their respective goal areas. Based on these indicators, the RTs established key purchase strategies on how to best achieve each goal area. Most important, the RTs were responsible for ranking and prioritizing agency or governmental activities.

## The Budgeting for Results Process

The BFR process consists basically of six steps: (1) setting major goal or result areas; (2) reviewing and finalizing agency activity inventories; (3) developing or fine-tuning chief indicators of progress and key strategies for achieving results; (4) holding public budget hearings for select result or goal areas; (5) sorting and prioritizing agency or governmental activities and identifying savings; and (6) distributing resources among goal areas, i.e., the finalization of the purchase plans by result areas.

While each step in the BFR process is important and consequential, the singular importance of indicators cannot be underestimated. Indicators are, of course, the “yardsticks” or measures by which progress toward goal areas can be assessed. This is integral to any performance-based budgeting system, especially activity-based budgets. Significant also in the context of the BFR process is that strategies or approaches for achieving goals or results are intertwined with and dependent upon the indicator of progress in that they are the guideposts for prioritizing agency activities. Hence, the right indicator combined with the right strategy will yield a composite of prioritized governmental activities that are goal-oriented and expected to achieve concrete results.

**Step #1 – Setting major goal or result areas.** The first step was to set major goal or result areas that need to be achieved in the state. Based on previous years' experience with BFR, we ultimately concluded that seven statewide goals would represent where the citizens of South Carolina wanted to focus in terms of results and progress made. Incidentally, these seven goal areas roughly coincide with the focus areas of the subcommittees of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

The following seven wide-ranging goals or results areas were identified:

1. Improve our K-12 student performance
2. Improve our higher education system and cultural resources
3. Improve the conditions for our economic growth
4. Improve the health and protections of our children and adults
5. Improve the quality of our natural resources
6. Improve the safety of our people and property
7. Improve central state government support and other governmental services

**Step #2 – Developing agency activity inventories.** The next step was to develop an all-inclusive inventory of the activities that state government performs. For each activity, three main elements were required – a description of the activity, its expected outcome, and its cost.

To acquire this activity information and data, working in conjunction with OSB, we requested, as in previous years, that each agency break down its budget into discrete and definitive activities. Each agency was instructed to provide a description of each activity it provides directly or indirectly to citizens of South Carolina. An activity was defined as something an organization does to accomplish its goals and objectives and that consumes resources and produces a product, service, or outcome. Most importantly, an activity should describe in a citizen-oriented way the following: what is done; for whom; why; at what cost; and what is to be expected or accomplished.

State agencies submitted agency activities to OSB, which entered them into an existing database. Most activities presented reflected previous years' submittals, excepting enhancements and new activities. Next, the TRT examined the activities to evaluate the quality of the activity descriptions and outcome measures. Those activities requiring more work or improvement were sent back to agencies for appropriate corrections or improvements. Once this was completed, OSB sorted the activities to correspond to the seven goal areas, or verified that assortments from previous arrangements were correct. For example, those activities – regardless of agency or department – that appeared to fall within the goal area of K-12 improvement were placed there; those activities that related to the improvement of health were directed there, and so forth.

Thus, the final product of this second step was the formation of a comprehensive inventory of activities, numbering more than 1,600 separate and distinct activities that comprised the entirety of what state government does, for whom, why, at what cost, and for what effects or outcomes.

### **Step #3 – Developing chief indicators of progress and key strategies for achieving results.**

Again, RTs were put together consisting of experts and knowledgeable citizen participants versed in the subject matter of each goal area. Each RT was headed by a team leader from the Governor's Office. OSB provided financial subject matter and research expertise for each RT.

Step 3 required each RT to identify chief *indicators* of progress based on verifiable and well-documented statistical sources (the U.S. Census Bureau, the U.S. Labor Department, USC's South Carolina Indicators Project, etc.). These were, according to experts and specialists in the subject matter, the best and most comprehensive indicators for a goal area.

After the identification of indicators, each RT then collectively identified *strategies* that it felt – based on scientific data and information and literature – demonstrated empirically broad and comprehensive achievement within a state goal area.

These indicators and, more importantly, their link to strategies were later utilized by the RTs as the basis or mechanism to review, analyze, and ultimately prioritize and rank activities which would advance the state toward the preset statewide goals.

Each RT then reevaluated the efforts of last year's teams in identifying indicators for each major goal. The indicators are key to the BFR effort and allow the state – particularly our administration, the General Assembly, state agencies, and the public at large – the opportunity to gauge the progress of accomplishing statewide policy goals, more specifically the seven goals designated in this FY 2011-12 Executive Budget. In addition, these indicators will allow our administration, the General Assembly, and the public to determine if the strategies we have identified in achieving the statewide goals are effective, especially for both short-term and, more importantly, *long-term* evaluative purposes.


Additionally, it should be emphasized once again that BFR is a budgeting approach that places emphasis on logic, order, and proven cause-and-effect relationships. Utilizing the highest degree of objectivity and data analysis, this approach involves not only the setting of broad goals, but also dividing these further into specific objectives and then identifying indicators, measurements, and strategies by which verifiable progress can be reasonably assessed over time.



Further, in Step 3, the BFR approach creates a strategic framework for RTs analysis and decision making. This framework comprises the following:

- Requires the consideration of the results citizens expect from government;
- Articulates those strategies that are most effective in achieving those results;
- Puts front and center those indicators which will best measure progress;
- And as relates to Step 4 (below), initiates an estimation or anticipation of prioritized spending to select or prioritize (buy) the activities that are most critical to implementing strategies and achieving (measuring) success;
- Helps keep the focus on contribution to priority results – lets RTs escape agency “silos” and consider instead statewide strategies;
- Makes performance information more relevant to budget choices;
- Helps frame the question, “Are we sure we are buying things at the best possible price?”; and
- Helps us describe the activities and results the *entire* budget will buy.

**Diagram of Interrelationships of Goals, Indicators, Activities and Strategies**



**Step #4 – Holding public budget hearings for each result area.** This step allowed the opportunity for the governor, the governor’s policy staff, appropriate RT members, and other interested parties – including the general public – to meet with agency heads and personnel to discuss governmental activities particular to a goal area. Generally, the discussions centered on how agency governmental activities were contributing to the results or goals set by our administration. Agencies were questioned about their most beneficial, highest priority activities, as well as those that were marginal or less productive.

**Step #5 – Sorting and prioritizing agency or governmental activities and identifying savings.** This step involved the RTs prioritizing or ranking – purchasing – governmental activities. The product or deliverable here was the development of a preliminary purchase plan of prioritized activities – an initial budget for each goal area.

Early on, the OSB had sorted activities by the designated goal areas (Step 2 – the developing of agency activity inventories). During the interim steps above, OSB had sorted activities by strategies which were developed by the RTs in Step 3 (i.e., the developing of chief indicators of progress and key strategies for achieving results). At this point, each RT was charged with reviewing the activities, not yet seen by the RTs, and deciding which *linked most closely* to their respective goal area, indicators, and strategies. Eventually, these activities were ranked by each team member (assigning an equivalent numerical value) based upon which goal area strategy it fell under. Obviously, those activities that appeared unrelated or less important to the goal area or, especially, the major purchase strategies were abolished, placed on a wish list, or sent to a more appropriate goal area or RT.

With this process completed, each RT, in effect, had ranked or prioritized its portion of the 1,600 activities to complete a goal-specific preliminary purchase plan, which was – by all accounts among RT participants – perceived as both thorough and complete. The RTs also reviewed all costs associated with the activities regardless of the funding source (e.g., state General Fund, federal and “other” monies). Most importantly, perhaps, this step was an opportunity for RT members to

challenge their previous assumptions and rationales for prioritization and to look for creative and innovative ways to do things differently and, hopefully, better. Central questions at this stage were, “Are these activities the most efficient and effective ways to achieve the designated goal area(s)?” “Does this budget plainly make sense? Can it *be easily understood* so that it produces the results South Carolinians want and at the right price?” Equally important, other questions that required answers, to the extent possible, included:

- Can these activities (those ranked, at a minimum, as “important”) realistically be measured in terms of performance or outcomes, and how?
- For those activities *not* purchased, what are likely to be the consequences?
- Can those activities that obviously appear to be duplicative, in and across agency structures, be eliminated or merged? If so, where can the cost savings be targeted in terms of other activities?
- What activities appear to be antiquated, no longer relevant to today’s citizenry? Can or should they be salvaged, or should they simply be abolished freeing up funds for more important, underfunded activities?
- What activities appear to be excessively funded, especially those ranked on the lower end of the prioritization list?
- In the final analysis, is this purchase plan for education, health, etc., the best possible budget – given the circumstances – for purposes of advancing the quality of life for all South Carolinians? Generally speaking, what more needs to be done in the future to make South Carolina great?


**Step #6 – Distributing resources among goal areas, i.e., finalizing the purchase plans by result areas.** The heart of Step 6 was the methodical and careful review by our administration of the preliminary purchase plans submitted by the RTs and the finalization of a completed purchase plan reflecting our philosophy and policies. Ultimately, this final purchase plan took the form and substance of this FY 2011-12 Executive Budget.

It is noteworthy that the review of the RTs' rankings or preliminary purchase plans and our administration’s finalization of priorities was not, by any means, an easy task. As was the case for previous executive budgets, many governmental activities were of nearly equal importance relative to purchase strategies and statewide goals. Further, we clearly stated that even though one activity was ranked below another activity, it was not correct to assume that the activity is of lesser value or importance than those prioritized above it. We did point out, however, that activities ranked in the upper 15 to 20 percent of a goal area were clearly of the greatest significance and that those at or near the bottom of the rung were, based on our estimation and analysis, perhaps not as valuable or central to selected strategies within identified goal areas.

Further, during Step 6 available funds and FTEs were spread, based on historical spending patterns and our preferences, across the seven goal areas. This was done, of course, only after constitutional and statutorily mandated expenditures were met (e.g., debt service, aid to subdivisions, and property tax relief). After spreading funds among the goal areas, we began using the information and data from the RT preliminary purchase plans, along with other research and materials to “purchase” activities of the highest priority until the funds allocated to the specific goal areas were exhausted.

The result was that those governmental activities that were of the greatest importance, or moderately so, to respective goal areas were funded. Those activities that fell below the “spending line” were not funded.

### The “Spending Line”



Finally, we offer some concluding observations about Step 6. Based on zero-based budgeting precepts and accepted activity-based procedures, we evaluated new activities on an equal basis as existing activities. The evaluation of a governmental activity was based on indicators and purchase strategies as related to the achievement of statewide goals. In other words, purchasing was done on the basis of anticipated outcomes rather than historical precedent.

As in prior years, during this process there were some activities that fell below the purchase line that gave us pause. However, given the priority ranking, the question that we had to ask ourselves was what activity above the purchasing line we would not purchase so that we could switch it with an activity below the line. This process, while difficult and tedious at times, helped us prioritize our spending in a world of limited resources and, equally important, was based on our spending cap. The resulting budget recommendations represent this new focus on maximizing results for the citizens of South Carolina.

## A Change in Budgeting Models and Mind-Set

**The man who is striving to solve a problem defined by existing knowledge and technique is not just looking. He knows what he wants to achieve, and he designs his instruments and directs his thoughts accordingly.**

**Rather than being an interpreter, the scientist who embraces a new paradigm is like the man wearing inverted lenses.**

– Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962)

The BFR process has proven to be successful and well-received by progressive-thinking legislators, the media, and the public. We believe that the process is innovative and pragmatic as a public budgeting mechanism.

This year's BFR effort was for us, as we stated last year, "a shift in paradigms." The outdated, traditional budgeting approaches of concentrating on apportioning new monies only, the concentrating on inputs alone, and the continuing bureaucracy-driven emphasis simply on self-preservation is no longer tenable during times when revenues are in a steep decline.

In a sense, BFR was born out of increasing recognition and comprehension of South Carolina's socio-economic makeup, status, and performance. More exactly, it resulted principally out of the understanding of our administration that conventional budgeting structures and processes were not keeping pace with the times.

In conclusion, we feel assured that the BFR process for FY 2011-12 was another excellent step forward in setting goals and priorities critical to South Carolina. In light of this, and the willingness among some members of the General Assembly to find ways to improve and enhance budgetary processes and decision making, we propose that a similar proviso be introduced as initiated by Rep. Dan Cooper five years ago and adopted by the House. As we did last year, we ask the General Assembly to adopt the following proviso in the FY 2011-12 appropriation bill:

***NEW PROVISIO (GP: Joint Committee on Activity-Based Budgeting).*** *There is established the Joint Committee on Activity-Based Budgeting composed of nine members. The nine members shall be appointed as follows: three Senators appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee; three members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; and three members appointed by the Governor. The Governor shall appoint the committee chairman. The terms of members shall be coterminous with the term of their appointing authority. Members of the Senate and House of Representatives shall serve ex officio. The committee shall study activity-based budgeting processes and how they may apply to the budget and appropriations processes for the State. Because the intent is to reduce duplication of government services, maximize cost-efficiencies, and still continue to provide excellent customer services, all costs of implementing a new budgeting system must be considered, including technological and human resource applications. Further, the committee will consider those budget*

*processes that incorporate zero-based principles, particularly those which examine the entirety of government and state funding. Such budget processes must additionally emphasize, to the extent possible, the establishment of clearly delineated statewide goals; activity outcomes and results; spending strategies and priorities; and the measurement of performance.*

*The committee may propose, by majority vote, a budget process not inconsistent to matters relating to the discharge of its duties. This proposal shall be reported to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee by no later than January 1, 2011.*

*Professional and clerical services for the committee must be made available from the staffs of the General Assembly, the Budget and Control Board, and other state agencies and institutions as needed. The members of the committee are not entitled to receive the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowed by law for members of boards, committees, and commissions when engaged in the exercise of their duties as members of the committee. All other costs and expenses of the committee must be paid in equal proportion by the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Office of the Governor, but only after the expenditures have been approved in advance by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the Governor.*

Revenue

## Revenue

There are four ways in which you can spend money. You can spend your own money on yourself. When you do that, why then you really watch out what you're doing, and you try to get the most for your money. Then you can spend your own money on somebody else. For example, I buy a birthday present for someone. Well, then I'm not so careful about the content of the present, but I'm very careful about the cost. Then, I can spend somebody else's money on myself. And if I spend somebody else's money on myself, then I'm sure going to have a good lunch! Finally, I can spend somebody else's money on somebody else. And if I spend somebody else's money on somebody else, I'm not concerned about how much it is, and I'm not concerned about what I get. And that's government.

- Milton Friedman, winner of the 1976 Nobel Prize in Economics

### Continued Economic Recession

Continuing a trend that began in 2008, dozens of states continue to see their state budgets decline. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, last year state lawmakers closed an aggregate budget gap of \$83.9 billion – even with the assistance of over \$38 billion in federal stimulus funds – and 15 states are reporting midyear deficits of \$26.7 billion. With the stimulus funds now set to disappear, and state revenues being slow to recover, FY 2011-12 projects to be one of the most difficult budget years in our state's history – much more difficult than previous two.

By the end of 2010, South Carolina's general fund has been reduced by over \$2 billion since June of 2008. Fortunately, the state has not been forced to make any mid-year reductions so far in FY 2010-11, however at least three agencies are projecting budget deficits for FY 2010-11 totaling \$265 million. These deficits for FY 2010-11 must be covered before any funds can be allocated for FY 2011-12.

We could highlight many factors that have contributed to our current economic situation. First, the financial troubles caused by sub-prime lending practices have led major financial institutions to make a host of risky investments. A number of these institutions have either become insolvent or have had to write-down billions of dollars in losses – ultimately turning to the federal government for help.

Second, a weak housing market has made credit problems worse because of mortgage securitization. Mortgage-backed securities' success depends on high housing prices. Unfortunately, housing prices fell dramatically – bringing a decline in housing construction and home values, losses in personal wealth, and negatively impacting consumer spending. Though the housing market showed some signs of stabilization last spring when the federal government offered a one-time homebuyer's tax



credit, as was the case with the federal government's "Cash-For-Clunkers" program, once the government subsidy expired so did the increase in demand.


Despite our nation's desperate fiscal position, some of our federal leaders continue to advocate for new or expanded government programs. For example, the bailout/stimulus bills passed in 2009 in Washington and the health care reform legislation, passed last March, will add trillions to the national debt. In federal fiscal year 2011 alone, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this year's federal deficit is projected could reach \$1.27 trillion, after reaching \$1.56 trillion in federal fiscal year 2010 – the highest on record and the largest as a percentage of the economy since the end of World War II. These deficits helped bring the National Debt to its current total of \$13.9 trillion.

In previous budgets, this administration has highlighted the fact that the Board of Economic Advisors' (BEA) revenue projects are frequently far too optimistic. For instance, revenue projections from FY 2000-01 to FY 2002-03 were of \$1.185 billion higher than actual revenues. Not surprisingly, this administration entered office with a \$1 billion shortfall that included an unconstitutional deficit and raided trust and reserve funds. Several years later, it appeared that little had changed as evidenced by our February 2008 letter to the BEA explaining why we believed BEA should lower its revenue estimates by approximately \$100 million. Interestingly enough, two months later the BEA was forced to cut their estimates by roughly \$90 million. We point out these instances to show that prudent economic forecasting is vital to eliminating these sorts of financial holes.

Given the nearly \$1.3 billion shortfall in the current fiscal year, our state's economists must make more realistic and reasonable forecasts of the economy as they consider future revenue projections. Both the MAP Commission and the GEAR Committee recommended changes to the way the state makes revenue estimates. The GEAR Committee recommended that the BEA use a national economic forecasting service when formulating revenue estimates. We agree and, once again, urge the General Assembly to look at the private sector for other means of accurately forecasting revenues. It seems prudent to find a way to project revenues that will take the political influences out of the process in order to make forecasting more accurate and realistic.

Currently, the BEA is forecasting that revenue will increase slightly 2012. For FY 2011-12, the BEA estimated general fund revenue to be \$5.864 billion – roughly the same amount as six years ago. Accordingly, we must prioritize state programs and fulfill only our citizens' most urgent needs.

### Percent Change in S.C. General Fund Revenue



### Increases to General Fund Revenue

During the late 1990's, the four largest cigarette manufacturers reached an agreement with 46 states, known as the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (MSA), to settle state lawsuits to recover costs associated with treating smoking-related illnesses. South Carolina began securitizing its MSA payments in FY 2000-01. It is estimated that the tobacco settlement will generate **\$10 million in revenue** for FY 2010-11.

The GEAR report found several cost savings opportunities at the Budget and Control Board that would generate nonrecurring revenue for the next fiscal year. We have included the recommendation that the Board could sell the Tempo program's building if the Board uses a statewide contract for temporary staffing services – saving approximately **\$2 million** in one-time revenue.

There are no easy solutions to close the nearly \$1 billion budget gap the state will confront in FY 2011-12. Some have suggested shortening the school year by 10 days. While no suggestion should be off the table this year, we do not believe that taking learning time away from our children – particularly when the state is already facing great challenges in the K-12 education arena – is a wise option. But given the difficult times hard decision must be made. It is in this vein that we propose

a 5% salary reduction for all state employees with annual salaries over \$35,000 – which is well above the average personal per capita income in South Carolina of \$28,000. This salary reduction will save \$98,215,345 in FY 2011-12. Additionally, this change will reduce the long-term unfunded liability associated with the South Carolina Retirement System by \$155 million.

## FY 2011-12 Executive Budget

We have identified some remaining revenue generators in the “Nonrecurring Revenue” section of the following chart.

<b>Recurring Revenue</b>		
<b>FY 2011-12 BEA Estimate Gross General Fund Revenue (Nov. 10, 2010)</b>		5,863,933,851
<b>Less:</b> Tax Relief Trust Fund		(545,680,709)
<b>Plus:</b> Tax Relief Trust Fund Carryforward		-0-
<b>Net General Fund Revenue Estimate FY 2011-12</b>		<b>5,318,253,142</b>
<b>Revenue Adjustments:</b>		
Remittance to GF for 5% Salary Reduction (Other Funded Positions)		42,775,904
<b>Less: FY 2010-11 Base Appropriations</b>		<b>5,080,373,895</b>
<b>“New” Recurring Revenue</b>		<b>314,133,079</b>
<b>Cost Savings:</b>		
Agency “Savings”		208,528,682
Below-the-Line “Savings”		56,710,383
Subtotal, Cost Savings		265,239,065
<b>TOTAL “NEW” FUNDS</b>		<b>579,372,144</b>
<b>Incremental Statewide Items:</b>		
General Reserve Fund <i>(5% of FY2010-11 actual revenues) (paid with nonrecurring dollars)</i>		17,141,169
Capital Reserve Fund		(6,045,540)
Debt Service		(11,026,093)
Homestead Exemption Fund – BEA Est. Shortfall (Nov. 10, 2010)		(17,888,481)
<b>Total Statewide Items</b>		<b>(12,753,460)</b>
<b>“New” Funds Less Statewide Items</b>		<b>592,125,604</b>
<b>Nonrecurring Revenue Sources</b>		
B&C Board – Sale of Property (Elimination of Tempo Program)		2,000,000
FY 2011-12 Capital Reserve Fund		110,883,455
Transfer of Cash from DMV (10-Year License)		773,000
Transfer of Cash from DMV (Notices/Correspondence)		325,000
Transfer Cash – DHEC Waste Funds		3,356,566
Cigarette Tax – Medicaid Reserve Fund (July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2012)		225,346,187
A.R.R.A. Stabilization Funds – Sustained Vetoes		501,948
License Plate Replacement		2,300,000
FY 2009-10 Contingency Reserve Fund		71,000,600
Tobacco Deallocation		10,000,000
Transfer of Cash from Film Incentives to General Fund		18,835,902
Anticipated FY 2011-12 Surplus		1,195,467
FY 2010-11 Projected Year End Surplus		276,753,323
<b>Total Nonrecurring Sources</b>		<b>696,485,513</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>		
Tobacco Deallocation		10,000,000

## Education Lottery Revenues

It has been argued that the commencement of the North Carolina lottery has caused South Carolina lottery sales to decrease. The BEA predicts that this year's decrease will be about \$252 million.

Because our lottery competes with lotteries in other states, it is more important than ever that we run our lottery as efficiently as possible to maximize the amount of money going towards education. For this reason, we again propose reducing the current retail commission of seven percent to a commission of six percent – which is in line with the national average. In addition, we recommend that the lottery advertising threshold be reduced to a more reasonable limit of 1/2 of one percent of the previous years' gross sales. These two recommendations will generate more lottery revenue to benefit our education system.

LOTTERY REVENUES	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
BEA Revenue Estimate	244,816,300	240,000,000
BEA Interest Estimate	2,500,000	2,500,000
Unclaimed Prizes	8,400,000	12,400,000
Surplus Cash		
Limit Retailer Commissions to 6 Percent of Sales		9,740,000
Limit Advertising Budget		4,121,000
<b>Education Lottery Revenue</b>	<b>255,716,300</b>	<b>268,761,200</b>

# Run a Fiscally Disciplined Government

## Run a Fiscally Disciplined Government

**Nobody spends somebody else's money as wisely as they spend their own.**

**– Milton Friedman, 1976 Nobel Laureate**


For the past 7 years, our administration has produced executive budgets with the overarching goal of eliminating spending that we believe is inconsistent with our state's priorities, because we adhere to the fundamental belief that excessive increases in government spending are not sustainable in the long run. In these challenging economic times in which we find ourselves, it is more important than ever that every tax dollar be directed toward the absolute core functions of state government.

We have consistently said that we need a wholesale change in the state's budgeting process that requires legislators to take a longer-term approach to spending and stop growing government faster than the underlying economy over our administration's objections. Previous legislative budgets simply spent all of the money coming to Columbia without much consideration of a possible economic downturn. In short, during our state's prosperous times, we failed to restrain spending and, as a result, we are now forced to cut many important programs.

### Planning for the Future

Although General Fund budgets since FY 2008-09 have garnered a lot of attention, what is not commonly known is that government spending has actually increased since FY 2008-09, to more than \$21.8 billion this current fiscal year. In FY 2011-12, total spending is expected to increase another 6 percent to \$23.11 billion.

### Total State Spending



Source: SC Budget Office


Much of the increase over the past few years is due to the large amount of stimulus dollars that the federal government has sent to our state. While we are not attempting to refight old battles, it is important to point out that when the federal stimulus money disappears after FY 2011, the state will see about \$1 billion evaporate from its budget.

The Office of State Budget most recent “Three-Year General Fund Financial Outlook” for FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 shows that, even assuming a 1.5 percent growth rate in sales tax and 1.65 individual income tax collections, respectively, the state is on track to be short of its ability to pay current obligations by \$876 million from the current budget in FY 2011-12, \$1.152 billion in FY 2012-13 and \$1.486 billion in FY 2013-14.

With this in mind, it is important that when crafting the FY 2011-12 budget, strong consideration be given toward how the state will cope with the potential shortfall of another \$1 billion as it plans for FY 2012-13 and beyond.

### Annualizations on the Rise

To put our state’s fiscal house in order, we must stop the practice of annualizations – using one-time money to fund recurring needs. Annualizations represent borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, and ultimately serve only to delay tough decisions for another year. The frequency with which the General Assembly uses annualizations is evidenced by the fact that annualizations nearly doubled in the two years preceding the current budget year. With the passage of the FY 2010-11 Appropriations Act, the annualizations reached \$1.274 billion – an unprecedented level. Whether we like it or not, the state is facing a significant deficit in 2012.





What is most troubling about our current circumstances is that much of the spending on core functions of state government – education, public safety and health – is now coming from one-time funds. For instance, in the FY 2010-2011 budget, K-12 education is receiving \$174 million in federal money that will not exist in the following year. The state will have to find this money somewhere in FY 2011-12, or education will be cut another \$174 million. The Department of Corrections and the Department of Health and Human Services also have a significant portion of their respective budgets coming from one-time funds.

We believe there needs to be a limit on annualization spending, which is why we continue to ask that annualizations not exceed one percent of total estimated revenue for a fiscal year. We understand that that is not possible this year because of the massive amount of stimulus funds that are included in the budget. However, this executive budget does reduce the annualizations in the budget by \$862 million – totaling **\$412 million**.

### Unfunded Liabilities

**Public pension...funding is woefully inadequate. Because the fuse on this time bomb is long, politicians flinch from inflicting tax pain, given that problems will only become apparent long after these officials have departed. Promises involving...generous cost-of-living adjustments are easy for these officials to make...those promises will be anything but easy to keep.**

- Warren Buffett (2007 letter to shareholders, writing about pension managers' projections of 8 percent returns)

Our retirement system's last reported unfunded liability as of the end of June 2009 was nearly \$12 billion. However, this number is only a part of the picture because it does not include \$9.3 billion of unfunded Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) costs for retirees' health care. The combined \$21 billion in unfunded liabilities is a key reason this administration was against the legislature's action two years ago to double the guaranteed cost-of-living increase for retirees. Specifically, the legislature increased investment return assumption to eight percent – 11 percent higher than the national median for public funds, 33 percent higher than Georgia's retirement system, and 43 percent higher than North Carolina's retirement system.

Put another way, South Carolinians now hold a \$21 billion "I.O.U." for unpaid political promises for retiree salaries and health care, meaning each taxpayer has an invisible \$10,000 mortgage. Ultimately, the frightening reality is that our combined retirement accounts likely will have less than half of the assets needed to pay our total anticipated long-term costs. These numbers will be even worse if we under-perform the eight percent assumed rate of return going forward.

In order to maintain our system's solvency, we must make long overdue changes now to lessen the potential pain for both taxpayers and retirees in the future. The GEAR Report made the following common-sense recommendations for non-vested employees in order to shore up finances of the retirement systems:

- Base retirement income on the salary from the last five years of employment rather than the last three years.
- Discontinue the practice of applying unused vacation pay to number before calculating retirement pay.
- Eliminate the TERI program.
- Discontinue the practice of applying unused sick leave to the length of service.
- Move back to a requirement of thirty years of service for full retirement (as is the standard in most states) as opposed to the reduced twenty-eight year requirement adopted by the legislature earlier this decade.

We believe these proposals will help improve our financial condition, but we must go further in order to begin addressing our tens of billions in debt and keep our state's high credit rating. One way to do so is to ask retirees to start paying a larger percentage of their health care costs. Agencies (and thus taxpayers) have traditionally paid the same cost-share for health care for retirees as state employees. From 1999 through today, taxpayers have paid between 67 and 82 percent of the health care costs for retirees and their families.

In FY 2012, retirees' total health cost is projected to be near \$483 million, which means that taxpayers will be paying \$343 million this year for retirees' health care. This burden is rapidly increasing from less than two percent of an agency's payroll in 1999 to 3.9 percent in the current budget year – an over 95 percent increase in the past decade.

On the South Carolina State Employees Association website, the President of SCSEA writes the following about how their benefits have been obtained (emphasis added):

*[D]emonstrations of our numerical strength have yielded retirement benefits second to none, a TERI program, 28 year retirement, pay raises and cost-of-living increases. None of these benefits came automatically. It is through the efforts of a united front of state employees and retirees, advocating for ourselves and others, who are not members, that all of these benefits accrued to us.*

The reality is that benefits accruing to government retirees have to come from somewhere – in this case, current taxpayers. However, the tens of billions in unfunded political promises will either have to come from our children and grandchildren or the entire system will collapse under the weight of its debt. Most taxpayers in South Carolina cannot afford retirement benefits “second to none” for themselves, much less for hundreds of thousands of public retirees.


We continue to believe greater steps need to be taken so that the state's financial burdens are not handed to the next generation of taxpayers, and we urge the General Assembly to consider our concerns in the next legislative session.

### **Outspending the Competition**

It is important that South Carolina remains competitive in this ever-changing global marketplace, and to do this, state government must be held accountable for every tax dollar it spends. In FY

2007 and FY 2008, South Carolina's government spending grew at the second fastest rate among Southeastern states. In fact, government spending increased by over 30 percent during this time period, according to the National Association of State Budget Officers.

Compared to the rest of the nation, up until the recent economic downturn, government in South Carolina cost almost 140 percent the United States average. This figure is cause for concern as we strive to compete against other states and attempt to invest valuable tax dollars back into the private sector.




Source: Governing Magazine

### Population Plus Inflation

South Carolina has historically been on a constant budgetary roller coaster ride. When revenues are up, spending dramatically increases. When revenues are down, budgets are slashed to the bone – jeopardizing the state's ability to deliver core government services to its citizens. The chart below reflects the dramatic ups and downs in the state budget over the last 15 years.

## Peaks and Valleys Approach to State Spending


(recurring and non-recurring dollars, in millions)



In past years, we have made our case for limiting government growth to a rate that is equal to the growth in population plus the growth in inflation. Adhering to this spending limit was especially important considering the large amounts of new revenue coming in during past budget cycles.

## State Government Growth Under Population Plus Inflation Spending Cap FY2005 - FY2010

(in millions)



While it is true that some cuts would still have been necessary over the last couple of years, it is also true that the cuts would not have been as deep as the ones we are currently experiencing. Likewise, citizens would not have become dependent on these services, only to have them disappear a couple of years later. Furthermore, had the state saved some of the money that was spent above the population plus inflation threshold, or paid off some of the unfunded liabilities discussed above, the state would find it in a much better fiscal position to emerge from the global recession.

We believe that when economic times are good, budget writers must resist the temptation to excessively spend tax dollars on new programs that cannot be sustained during challenging financial times. Recognizing that in the current political system in which we operate it is not realistic to expect the entire General Assembly to agree to save a dollar instead of spending a dollar, the only way for the state to prevent ending up in the same position that we are in today is to constitutionally limit the rate at which state government can grow.

We'd thank the House and the Senate for taking action last year by debating several pieces of legislation that would positively impact the boom-bust cycle so harmful to our state's budget practices including the proposal to increase the General Reserve Fund by two percent in addition to spending cap bills on the House and Senate side. However, there are two concerns that we had with these bills from last year and they fall into two categories.

The first relates to the cap itself. We believe the more appropriate cap to use would be a population-plus-inflation model because it is more predictable and it is more responsive to current economic conditions. For these reasons, we would respectfully urge both bodies to adopt population plus inflation as the measure for determining the cap.

Our second concern relates to what happens to the money over and above the cap. A spending cap that allows more spending is really no cap at all, which is why we prefer money held in a spending limit fund to be prioritized in two possible ways. Our first priority would be to dedicate surplus dollars to paying down the roughly \$21 billion in the state's unfunded liabilities linked to retirement. In the unlikely scenario these liabilities are fully paid back, we would then propose splitting the remaining funds equally, with half refunded to the taxpayer and the other half going to capital projects.

### Spending Transparency

**We might hope to see the finances of the Union as clear and intelligible as a merchant's books, so that every member of Congress and every man of any mind in the Union should be able to comprehend them, to investigate abuses, and consequently to control them.**

– Thomas Jefferson

This administration believes that South Carolinians are entitled to complete and unrestrained access to information regarding how their hard-earned tax dollars are being spent by state government. In this vein, we'd thank the Comptroller General's office for its efforts to maintain a state Spending

Transparency website which gives citizens with a greater degree of information about how their tax dollars are used. The site was created pursuant to a Spending Transparency Executive Order issued in 2007, and allows citizens to review state spending by agency and budget year. The site is located at <https://ssl.sc.gov/SpendingTransparency>. This website gives voters the ability to hold government accountable for its decisions.

Modernize Government

## Modernize Government

South Carolina [government] still runs on its 1895 constitution. Guess what? It doesn't work.

– Josh Goodman, *Governing Magazine* (August 2008)

### An Archaic Government – A Historical Perspective

In 2010, South Carolina's government structure still largely resembles the government first established by a 115-year-old state Constitution during a period of racial turmoil and with the primary goal of diluting executive power. In this rapidly transforming world that is defined by innovation, competition, and globalization, South Carolina will be left behind if we fail to modernize and restructure state government.

The 1895 state Constitution was adopted in response to two things: 1) the 1865 state Constitution failed to meet Congress' requirement that all states adopt the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment giving blacks equal protection of the laws, which resulted in Congress abolishing South Carolina's General Assembly and 2) to the dismay of state leaders like Ben "Pitchfork" Tillman, the 1868 state Constitution afforded too many rights to African-Americans. Tillman was elected governor in 1890, and in his inaugural address he summed up the 1895 Constitution's purpose and intent by saying that "[t]he whites ... have absolute control of the State government, and we intend any and all hazards to retain it."<sup>1</sup> This was accomplished by denying equal rights for African-Americans, requiring literacy tests and poll taxes to vote, separating schools, prohibiting interracial marriages, and spreading power among several areas of government due to fear of a governor, especially an African-American governor, having too much power.

At a time when most other states and the federal government were moving toward executive centrality, the 1895 Constitution adopted the "long ballot," which required the governor to share executive power among nine constitutionally elected officers. Although this constitution nominally referred to the governor as the "chief executive," the long ballot and other measures adopted by the General Assembly prevented him from carrying out his duty to manage the state's executive functions. For example, even though many other states were in the midst of reforms to give the chief executive more control over government spending, in 1919 the General Assembly created a three-member Budget Commission, today known as the Budget and Control Board, to ensure legislative dominance over spending policy.<sup>2</sup> Remarkably, this mindset continues almost a century later.

In addition to creating the archaically-structured Budget and Control Board, the General Assembly diluted executive power by creating numerous state agencies that are not directly accountable to the Chief Executive. Until 1993, state government amassed **145 agencies** – not one of which was

---

<sup>1</sup> Walter Edgar, *South Carolina: A History*, p.11, University of South Carolina (1998).

<sup>2</sup> Luther F. Carter and Richard Young, *The South Carolina Governor*, p.13, University of South Carolina (2003).



directly accountable to the governor. Most agencies were governed by a board or commission appointed by the governor, Legislature, or both.

This menagerie of governance forms has resulted in fragmentation, confusion, redundancy, and a lack of accountability in state government that continues to this day. In fact, fourteen major studies over the course of 87 years came to the same conclusion: the General Assembly should consolidate state agencies and centralize executive authority.

Fifteen years ago, a movement to restructure and modernize state government began. Now, 16 agencies are part of the governor's cabinet, and the governor can finally submit his own executive budget proposal, which until 1993 was prepared and submitted by the Budget and Control Board.

Make no mistake; progress has been made on this front during our administration. During the last seven years, three agencies have been added to the executive branch's cabinet. The newest addition to the cabinet is the Department of Employment and Workforce (DEW). DEW was added to the cabinet in 2010 and combines the functions of the Department of Commerce's job placement services with the former Employment Security Commission. DEW will be better able to connect unemployed workers with potential employers – all while ensuring people receive unemployment checks.

In 2003, Department of Motor Vehicles was moved into the cabinet and as a result, average wait times decreased from over an hour to 10 minutes. In 2007, the Department of Transportation was moved into the governor's cabinet. Since then, the Department of Transportation has saved on over \$200 million. These are important steps toward leaving the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Nevertheless, we still have a long way to go to modernize state government and join the rest of the nation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **An Inefficient Government – The Numbers**

For almost eight years, this administration has said that government should be reorganized to run like a business – focused exclusively on its customers. Becoming more efficient, effective, and accountable to the taxpayer ultimately results in less waste and better services.

Unfortunately, South Carolina's government continues to grow, spending continues to increase, and accountability has not improved. This lack of efficiency and accountability is most apparent when looking at the following statistics:

- In South Carolina, the cost of government is almost 140 percent of the national average.
- South Carolinians pay more than 17.2 percent of their personal income for government, while the national average is less than 13.1 percent.

Due to these excesses, coupled with a severe economic recession, our state is now struggling to deal with a \$1 billion budget shortfall that could have been mitigated if the state had begun the process of restructuring seven years ago. Fortunately, the General Assembly has an opportunity to restructure state government to address these budget shortfalls in the new legislative session. Government restructuring will not only help us recover from the current budget crisis, but will help

avoid further near-term shortfalls and stabilize government growth in the long-term. This executive budget provides a roadmap for deriving much-needed savings while making government more efficient and accountable.

### **A Proven Solution – Evidence that Restructuring Works**

For seven years we have presented our restructuring proposals to the General Assembly, and for seven years we have heard the same question from legislators – show me how restructuring will make government more efficient and effective. Our administration has responded by pointing to the numerous studies performed over the course of 87 years and the undeniable efficiencies achieved by agencies that are part of an accountable, cabinet structure.

#### *Restructuring Studies*

Dating back to as early as 1920 and as recently as 2007, 14 major restructuring studies have consistently found that South Carolina state government is too large, fragmented, unwieldy, and unaccountable.

The first in-depth report came in 1991 out of the South Carolina Commission on Government Restructuring formed by Governor Campbell and co-chaired by Democratic Lt. Governor Nick Theodore and Republican House Speaker David Wilkins. This study determined that a prescription for better government is an overall state structure that:

- Establishes clear lines of authority, responsibility, and accountability;
- Concentrates Executive Branch authority, responsibility, and accountability;
- Creates a manageable span of control;
- Integrates functions into a smaller number of departments;
- Enhances the responsiveness of state government to the needs of South Carolina's citizens; and
- Seeks continuous improvement of the quality of policies and procedures.

The study concluded that:

The cabinet form of government...will lead to a unity in direction and purpose of state government through a clearly defined hierarchical structure, headed by the state's highest elected official. An elected chief executive, responsible for administration and with the power to make the bureaucracy work, is in the best position to achieve administrative effectiveness and political accountability.

Using this prescription, the 1991 Commission proposed to consolidate 145 state agencies, boards and commissions into 15 cabinet departments. In 1993, the General Assembly adopted about half of the Commission's proposal. Three reports since that time reaffirmed the need to finish implementing the 1991 proposal fully to modernize state government – the 2003 Task Force on Government Restructuring and Campaign Finance Report, the 2003 MAP Commission Report, and the 2007 GEAR Commission Report.

The 2003 Governor's Commission on Management, Accountability, and Performance (MAP) also found areas in our state government that are duplicative, inefficient, or just plain wasteful and determined that further government restructuring would result in a first-year's savings of \$225 million, followed by savings of \$300 million in future years. The math is simple. If the General Assembly adopted the MAP Commission's suggestions in 2004, the total savings, after 6 years of implementation, would be \$2.025 billion.<sup>3</sup>

In 2007, the Government Efficiency and Accountability Review (GEAR) Committee focused its study on the Budget and Control Board, finding ways to reduce costs, increase accountability, improve services, and help our state become more competitive in a global economy. The committee offered 61 recommendations which, if implemented, would save the taxpayers almost \$500 million over the next few years – a significant amount that could have helped relieve our current budget shortfall.

Study after study has concluded that our current government structure is cumbersome, fragmented, inefficient, and unaccountable. Since previous restructuring efforts have proven the cabinet system works, it is time for the General Assembly fully to implement the restructuring plans set forth in 1991 and proposed in this executive budget.

### Proven Examples

While numerous studies have shown that a streamlined, cabinet form of government is better, our administration has proven it actually works. From the Department of Corrections' nationally-recognized efficiencies in food and medical costs to the State Parks Service becoming one of the top 10 most self-sufficient systems in the nation, our administration has produced dozens of examples of how accountability leads to more efficient and effective government. The Department of Motor Vehicles has provided the most dramatic example of how a simplified cabinet agency can save money and, at the same time, provide better services. Since 2003, DMV has drastically slashed wait times, and provided customers with an increasing number of online services, all while saving more than \$65 million to the General Fund since 2003. As recently as FY 2008-09, DMV offered another \$10 million in surpluses to the General Fund which was used to shore up budget shortfalls.

Here are some other examples of how an accountable, cabinet structure produces results:

- The Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism reorganized itself by aligning the human capital and financial resources to assure maximum funds were allocated to the higher priority program areas. As a result, PRT has reduced the personal services budget by over \$3 million during the last five years. The agency also currently operates with 147 fewer full time employees than in fiscal year 2005, allowing it to reinvest those savings in advertising – with a return of \$32 for each dollar invested. These initiatives have contributed to South Carolina's tourism growing from \$14.7 billion a year in 2003 to \$18.4 billion in 2010.

---

<sup>3</sup> If those savings were returned to the taxpayers, each person would receive \$443.95. Additionally, if those savings were prudently managed, the state would not be faced with a billion dollar plus shortfall in the upcoming fiscal year.

- The Department of Corrections built a grist mill and expanded poultry operations for eggs, saving taxpayers \$750,000 annually. The agency also cut 70 teachers and administrative staff and replaced them with media-based lessons, saving more than \$4 million, while at the same time increasing certificate completions by over 20 percent.
- The Department of Commerce led the Southeast in jobs recruited and capital investment per capita in 2009. These outstanding results were achieved despite a 68 percent budget cut over the last two fiscal years.
- The Department of Social Services has achieved a total savings of \$14,260,025 since 2003. Some of these savings were achieved from the Electronic Benefits Transfer (\$5,255,568) which reduced per case cost of \$2.33 in years 2002-07, to a current per case cost of \$0.86. Additionally, DSS eliminated the printing costs for checks to foster and adoptive parents and embraced an electronic benefits method, which will generate about \$100,000 in savings to taxpayers.
- The Department of Transportation, the most recent addition to the governor's cabinet, has already achieved over \$200 million in cost savings, which has allowed the agency to reinvest that money back into infrastructure.

These are just a few examples that prove a cabinet form of government is far more likely to create greater efficiencies and accountability than our current structure.

### A Government Ready for Change

**...[T]he chances seem good that, before too long, South Carolina government will step out of its 19<sup>th</sup> century clothing and move toward the structure that prevails virtually everywhere else in America.**

**– Josh Goodman, *Governing Magazine* (August 2008)**

Although the weakened national and state economies have deepened our budget shortfall, it is undeniable that spending restraint, better budgeting practices, and a more efficient government structure could have softened the economic blow.

While these times are challenging, it is also an opportunity to streamline and simplify government and make the chief executive directly accountable for government's performance. President Ronald Reagan captured this moment appropriately in his nomination acceptance speech in 1980, quoting President Franklin D. Roosevelt when he said:

And the time is now to redeem promises once made to the American people by another candidate, in another time and another place. He said, "For three long years I have been going up and down this country preaching that government – federal, state, and local – costs too much. I shall not stop that preaching. As an immediate program of action, we must abolish useless offices. We must

eliminate unnecessary functions of government...we must consolidate subdivisions of government and, like the private citizen, give up luxuries which we can no longer afford. ”

We have been very pleased to see the House of Representatives pass several parts of our restructuring plans over the years, including the creation of a Department of Administration. The House has also adopted constitutional amendments to ask voters to unify the Executive Branch by reducing the number of constitutional officers. The time has long passed for the Senate to follow suit.

This January we ask the General Assembly to quickly adopt a Department of Administration and reconsider our complete Restructuring Plan for the reasons we have explained in this section in order to give the governor all the tools needed to be successful.

### **Our Restructuring Plan**

Our plan includes three major goals and specific agency reorganization recommendations to accomplish these goals, which are explained below.

#### **1. Create Executive Accountability for Central Administrative Functions**

As with private corporations, accountability is essential for governments to function properly. Yet South Carolina is the only state in the country that empowers a hybrid legislative/executive board, the Budget and Control Board, to oversee the state’s administrative support functions. To better manage support services to state agencies, we propose placing crucial Board-managed administrative functions within a cabinet-level Department of Administration.

In 1919, the General Assembly created a Budget Commission made up of the Governor and the Chairmen of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees. For the next three decades, despite the legislative imbalance, the Budget Commission expanded its power to include administrative and executive functions, and by the 1940s, the Commission was exercising fiscal authority that governors in other states exercised unilaterally.<sup>4</sup>

Today, the five-member Budget and Control Board is an enormous institution which employs more than 1,100 people and provides nearly every state agency with a variety of services and support, ranging from procurement and mail delivery, to human resources and data/telecommunications services, to retirement and building maintenance. Nearly a century later, the Board is dominated by legislative influence that undermines the constitutionally-based principles of separation of powers and checks and balances between the legislative and executive branches.

This cumbersome structure results in a lack of accountability and contributes to increased costs at the Board. The chief executive of any well-run company or well-run state must have direct, clear lines of authority to be successful.

---

<sup>4</sup> Luther F. Carter and Richard Young, *The South Carolina Governor*, p.13, University of South Carolina (2003).

As previously mentioned, the GEAR report highlighted the inefficiencies that exist under the current executive framework. In addition to finding \$500 million in potential savings, the GEAR report also found that the Budget and Control Board could release at least \$20 million in carry-forward funds to the General Fund, a surplus due to overcharging state agencies for IT services, which could greatly ease the current budget woes. Further, the GEAR Committee found another \$146 million that could be re-allocated to fund more pressing needs of the state. We again urge the General Assembly to reconsider the GEAR Committee's recommendations.

More importantly, we again urge the General Assembly to create a Department of Administration to manage the state's central administrative functions, including the daily operations of state government. As the state's chief executive, the governor should be responsible for the central administration of the executive branch – a responsibility given to every other governor in the nation.

### **Budget and Control Board Restructuring Plan**

**Create a Department of Administration with a director appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate.**

**From the Budget and Control Board and the Governor's Office:**

1. Office of General Services – Our state owns over 8,000 buildings comprising 60 million square feet of space with no central authority to make management decisions. Tens or even hundreds of thousands of square feet of state-owned office space sits vacant, yet the state leases hundreds of thousands more square feet of office space from the private sector.
2. Office of Human Resources – Not having any one person in charge or responsible can allow for the perpetuation of programs that need to be fixed or ended.
3. Employee Insurance Program.
4. Chief Information Officer – This office has the potential to give state agencies the principal means to improve delivery of IT services and lower the cost of government, but it has yet to accomplish these goals and is not directly responsible or accountable for this failure. It is telling that in six years there have been four CIOs.
5. Energy Office.
6. Division of Procurement Services – Our state's antiquated procurement system, currently overseen by the Budget and Control Board, sometimes serves as a roadblock that unnecessarily slows down time-sensitive projects. For instance, the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism recently engaged the procurement system to assist them in outsourcing the state's bait and tackle shops. What should have been a simple procurement matter was delayed, thereby preventing PRT from outsourcing these shops within a reasonable timeframe.
7. Division of Internal Audit and Performance Review.
8. Research and Statistics (excluding Digital Cartography and Precinct Demographics) – Digital Cartography and Precinct Demographics are related to redistricting after the Decennial Census, which is largely a legislative branch function.
9. One-half of the Executive Director's office.
10. One-half of the Internal Operations office.
11. Governor's Office of Executive Policy and Programs (excluding Guardian *ad Litem* Office, Continuum of Care, and the state Ombudsman).



**Budget and Control Board responsibilities**

By moving central administrative functions to the governor's cabinet as identified above, the Budget and Control Board would then be free to focus on key areas of state fiscal policy, specifically by:

1. Approving state revenue and expenditure projections.
2. Authorizing the issuance of bonds.
3. Addressing budgetary shortfalls.
4. Administering the State Retirement System.
5. Exercising other specific fiscal responsibilities, as enumerated by law.

We also propose that the Department of Administration house the State Inspector General.

**Department of Administration – Inspector General**

State Inspector General – We propose creating a central office responsible for identifying waste, fraud, and abuse within the executive branch. The Inspector General's Office would be established and appointed for a six-year term in the same manner as the Chief of the State Law Enforcement Division. The Inspector General would be nominated by the governor and confirmed by the Senate, serving a six-year term.

2. Modernize the Executive Branch's Organizational Structure

The South Carolina Constitution, ratified in 1895 when all women and most African-Americans were effectively disenfranchised, established a very weak executive branch of government, which shares executive branch power, among the governor and eight statewide constitutional officers. Such a large number of elected executive branch officials frequently results in our government working at cross-purposes and producing conflicting public policy. Although ostensibly for the voters' benefit, the current Executive Branch structure results in a bifurcated system with no clear lines of responsibility. South Carolina will be better served by having the governor appoint these officers.

For example, consider the Superintendent of Education. One of the primary issues in the gubernatorial campaign every four years is education. Our state's struggles in education are well-documented – yet no clear lines of accountability exist. The governor has little authority to implement any reforms, no matter how desperately they are needed and no matter how loudly the citizens cry for change. Accountability in the area of education is shared among the 170 members of the General Assembly, the Superintendent of Education, the state Board of Education, and the governor. With so many "leaders," there is no accountability. We are not suggesting that a governor-appointed Superintendent of Education will solve all of our education problems. However, a cabinet-level Superintendent will provide one coherent education policy throughout South Carolina and a direct line of accountability to the governor, who is ultimately responsible for the rate of progress within our public education system.

Another example is our administration's concerns over the recent program created by the Lieutenant Governor's office called Senior Shield, which helps senior citizens identify legitimate businesses in the state. While our administration supports this program's good intentions, we do not believe the state should be spending scarce dollars on a program that is largely duplicative of other consumer protection programs already available in the public and private sectors. Our differing takes on whether to implement this new program would not be an issue if the governor and lieutenant governor ran on the same ticket. This example is also emblematic of the larger problem within state government – the governor is unable to speak with a unified voice to citizens and taxpayers because he must share executive authority with eight statewide constitutional officers.

We propose reducing number of the state's constitutional officers as follows:

**Place the Governor and Lieutenant Governor on the same ticket.**

In the long-standing tradition of the federal executive branch, where the President and Vice President run on the same ballot, we propose having the Governor and Lieutenant Governor run together as a team (as they do in 24 other states).

**Allow the Governor to appoint the following cabinet positions, with the advice and consent of the Senate:**

1. **Adjutant General** – In an effort to depoliticize the military branch of state government and to provide a greater degree of accountability within the governor's constitutionally-established role as "commander-in-chief," we propose having the Adjutant General appointed by the governor (as in 49 other states).
2. **Commissioner of Agriculture** – As with the Adjutant General, to streamline the executive branch and provide greater accountability, we propose having the Commissioner of Agriculture appointed by the governor (as they do in 30 other states). Additionally, the governor would be accountable for a major economic sector of the state.
3. **State Superintendent of Education** – We propose having the state Superintendent of Education appointed by the governor (as they do in 11 other states) to provide central accountability for the state's public education system.
4. **Secretary of State** – As has been proposed by many people, including former Secretaries of State, we propose having this officer appointed by the governor (as they do in 10 other states).

3. Simplify, Streamline, and Create More Accountability in Government

Fourteen major studies of South Carolina's government over the last 88 years have reached a similar conclusion: South Carolina's government has far too many agencies, making the government disjointed, unwieldy, and unaccountable. We have a hodgepodge of 70 independent agencies, commissions, and departments, which provide hundreds of often-redundant programs or services.

Although the General Assembly made limited reforms to the executive structure in 1993, more than 80 percent of our executive agencies remain outside the scope of the governor's authority. To



provide better service and better value to our clients – the taxpayers – we need to consolidate departments under the cabinet.

The framework for better state government, as gleaned from the major reorganization studies, is based on six principles:

1. Establish clear lines of authority, responsibility, and accountability;
2. Concentrate the authority and accountability at a single point, the governor;
3. Accord responsibility in a reasonable and manageable manner;
4. Integrate governmental functions into a small number of departments;
5. Enhance state government's responsiveness to the needs of the citizens; and
6. Seek continuous improvement in the quality and effectiveness of state government through emphasis on customer service, strategic planning, and other quality management principles.

Guided by these six principles, our proposal seeks to consolidate, simplify, and make our state agencies more accountable – a task which becomes more feasible through a strong cabinet form of government, headed by the governor.

We anticipate adoption of our Restructuring Plan in this area will result in savings of nearly \$16 million for FY 2011-12.

### **Education Restructuring Plan**

Both the MAP Commission and the South Carolina Commission on Government Restructuring recognized the need to consolidate educational programs with similar missions, policies, and programs to provide better opportunities for coordination and prevent competition for scarce resources. Accordingly, we propose the following plan:

#### **State Department of Education**

1. Transfer the State Board of Education's powers to the Superintendent of Education, who would be appointed by the governor subject to Senate confirmation.
2. Move ETV, the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School, School for the Deaf and Blind, the John de la Howe School, the Governor's School for Science and Mathematics, and the Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities under the administrative direction of the State Department of Education. **Savings: \$1,166,844**

We propose that those agencies' current responsibility be given to the Superintendent of Education, and that each entity's executive board would serve in an advisory capacity.

### **Health Care Restructuring Plan**

Our state health and human service delivery system is fragmented and disjointed, with too many agencies providing redundant and costly services. In January 2003, the Legislative Audit Council (LAC) conducted an in-depth study of our eight health and human service agencies, noting that five

of the eight agencies are outside the governor's cabinet. The LAC found that multiple agencies provide similar services, increasing the cost of coordinating health care services. Predictably, the costs were due to administrative overlap primarily in the areas of finance, personnel, and IT.

The LAC report also found, because most of the health and human services agencies are outside the cabinet, that there is "no central point of accountability for [the agencies'] performance." Further, the report indicated that "[a] cabinet system could increase accountability and responsiveness to client concerns by directly linking the performance of agencies with a single statewide elected official who is authorized to implement changes." The report concluded:

If programs with similar services were consolidated into fewer agencies, under the authority of a single cabinet secretary, obtaining help from state government could be made less complex. The need for different agencies to make referrals to each other could be reduced while planning and budgeting could be done more comprehensively. In most cases, administrative costs could be lower.

In October 2004, the LAC produced a follow-up report, which concluded that while a few minor recommendations had been made, none of the health and human service restructuring recommendations had been implemented.

Most recently, in November 2008, the LAC released a new audit of the Department of Disabilities and Special Needs (DDSN) which cited numerous incidents of inefficiencies and failures to follow agency protocols. This report reaffirms our previous proposals of making DDSN directly accountable to the governor, who can hold this agency responsible to the families it serves.

We largely agree with the LAC reports, and we have based much of our proposed structure around its findings. Our main concern is the desire for services that efficiently and effectively meet consumers' needs – which our current system clearly fails to do.

We propose to merge these health and human services agencies into a single delivery system under a cabinet-level director to improve accountability, care, and responsiveness to our citizens.

Department of Health Oversight and Finance
1. Rename the Department of Health and Human Services the Department of Health Oversight and Finance.
2. This agency will continue to be the lead agency for Medicaid oversight and finance of Medicaid expenditures.

**Department of Health Services (Health Services)**

1. Division of Public Health (currently the health programs at the Department of Health and Environmental Control). **Proposed Restructuring Savings: \$4,197,236**
2. Division of Mental Health (currently Department of Mental Health). **Savings: \$5,262,488**
  - The powers of the current Mental Health Commission would be given to the director of Health Services, and the members of the commission would serve as an advisory board.
  - Continuum of Care for Emotionally Disturbed Children would be moved from the Governor's Office to the new Division of Mental Health. **Savings: \$70,548**
3. Division of Disabilities and Special Needs (currently Department of Disabilities and Special Needs) **Savings: \$1,938,303**
  - The powers of the current Disabilities and Special Needs Commission would be given to the director of Health Services, and the commission would serve as an advisory board.
4. Division of Addiction Services (currently Department of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Services). **Savings: \$208,737**

**Department of Rehabilitative Services**

1. Merge the Vocational Rehabilitation Department with the Commission for the Blind. **Savings: \$150,000**
2. The administrative responsibilities of the Vocational Rehabilitation Department and the Commission for the Blind would be given to a director appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the Senate.
3. The board members of the Vocational Rehabilitation Department and the Commission for the Blind would serve on advisory boards.

**Department of Transportation Reform Plan**

A priority for this administration in 2007 was to provide more accountability within the Department of Transportation (DOT). We were pleased to see the General Assembly adopt some of our recommendations by giving the governor the authority to appoint the Secretary and by creating standards by which road projects are prioritized. Initial indications show that changes at DOT are producing results. DOT has saved at least \$200 million in taxpayer money by implementing new initiatives to reduce costs, including decreasing agency travel and fuel consumption and eliminating funding for Washington lobbyists.

While these results are encouraging, it might take more than one attempt to achieve true reform. The DOT's Commission continues as a quasi-accountable entity and still has the ability to override the ranking criteria. To ensure true accountability and to provide a clear line of responsibility, we encourage the General Assembly to remove the existing system by eliminating the Commission.

The following proposal will allow the Department of Transportation to be more accountable and cost effective, and most importantly, will improve transportation services.

**State Department of Transportation**

Transfer the powers of the Commissioners of the state Department of Transportation to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation.

**Environment and Natural Resources Restructuring Plan**

South Carolina's environmental and natural resource programs are distributed among several state agencies. In our view, there should be a closer connection between the management of our natural resources and our environmental regulation. Furthermore, we believe the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) should be split into two separate state agencies under a more accountable cabinet structure. This proposal will bring us in line with similar agencies in neighboring states, like the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources and the Georgia Department of Natural Resources – both of which provide environmental regulation and enforce wildlife laws.

Our current system's inefficiencies are exhibited by the bifurcated approach to water quality, which is managed by both the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and DHEC. By combining the water conservation activities from DNR with the water regulatory activities from DHEC, we will be able to provide a cost-effective and comprehensive management of this crucial state resource. Additionally, the need for more accountability at DHEC is obvious due to numerous incidents where the agency has failed to balance business interests with the duty to regulate environmental pollution. Without direct accountability, DHEC will continue to avoid the consequences of its mistakes.

**Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)**

1. Division of Environmental Protection (currently the Environmental Quality Control Division and the Ocean and Coastal Resource Management Division of the Department of Health and Environmental Control).
  - Maintain an environmental regulatory board.
2. Division of Natural Resources (currently the Department of Natural Resources). **Savings: \$762,726**
  - The powers of the current Department of Natural Resources Board would be given to the DENR director, and the members of the Board would serve as an advisory board.
3. Division of Forestry (currently the South Carolina Forestry Commission). **Savings: \$395,297**
  - The powers of the current Forestry Commission would be given to the DENR director, and the members of the Commission would serve as an advisory board.

### Corrections and Probation Services Restructuring Plan

South Carolina is one of only 10 states that divide the Department of Corrections' functions from those of the Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services (PPP). Our proposal creates a single cabinet agency that will ensure offenders are managed by the same entity from initial incarceration to final release. We believe a unified system will have several other benefits, including:

1. Better coordination and exchange of information, resources, and personnel.
2. Savings from eliminating administrative duplication and allowing for better use of scarce programming resources in areas such as drug and alcohol treatment programs and re-entry programs.
3. A single point of contact for victims of crime to learn about the status of offenders from entry to sentence completion.

By joining the entities, one agency will manage these related functions, and we will improve coordination, better manage limited resources, realize significant financial savings, and improve protection for law-abiding citizens.

Further, we propose combining the Parole Board at PPP with the Parole Board at the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Both Parole Boards have similar budgets, even though the DJJ Parole Board hears far fewer cases each year. Because both boards have similar missions, their merger presents an opportunity to realize significant cost savings.

Department of Corrections and Probation	
1. Division of Corrections.	
2. Division of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services. <b>Savings: \$2,000,000</b>	
– The PPP Parole Board would be combined with the DJJ Parole Board to perform probation, parole, and pardon functions. <b>Savings: \$144,119</b>	

### Economic Development Reform Plan

South Carolina is currently facing unprecedented, rapid transformation of the national and international economies. This transformation, the “emerging new economy,” is defined by globalization with an ever-increasing reliance on knowledge-based technologies and is highlighted by intense competition, creativity, inventiveness, and innovation.

Our administration clearly acknowledges this economic phenomenon, and we sincerely hope the leadership in the General Assembly will join us. We have a mutual interest – the economic development of South Carolina – and we believe firmly that traditional approaches to economic development are out of sync with this emerging economy. No longer will a piecemeal, localized approach at economic development, led by 170 mini-Secretaries of Commerce suffice to bring South Carolina into 21<sup>st</sup> century economic realities. Through cooperation, reflection, research, and planning, a comprehensive strategy can stabilize and energize South Carolina's economy. Further,

we believe that the government should improve the economic “soil conditions” and allow the business sector to do what it does best. We propose four key objectives:

1. Bring together the relevant stakeholders – industry, academia, and government – to collaborate in developing a shared economic strategy for South Carolina.
2. Assess the competitive position of South Carolina and of the selected industry clusters in the state.
3. Identify key challenges, opportunities, and new strategic directions for South Carolina.
4. Promote consensus on an economic strategy and action agenda for South Carolina.

Our administration’s primary goal is job creation and economic development. Numerous federal, state, and local resources are poured into programs to help create jobs and promote economic development, but our antiquated practice of ineffectively scattering these resources among multiple state agencies with nearly-identical missions, along with our tendency to allow powerful legislators to spend significant resources on local projects that do little to promote lasting economic development, minimizes the effect of these resources.

For an example of more effective use of resources, look at the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) which was created in 1998 to fund job training and employment programs. Moving the WIA program from the Employment Security Commission to the Department of Commerce a few years ago, and now to the Department of Employment and Workforce, has ensured that over \$79 million in WIA funds is used to help build the high-skilled workforce South Carolina needs in order to attract new industry.

To maximize the effect of our economic development dollars and to ensure a consistent, cohesive, and strong economic mission, we propose housing our economic development programs within a single agency. Further, the administrative savings would allow the greater resources to be focused on the core missions of job creation and economic development. Our proposed consolidation offers us a great tool in strengthening the focus of our resources in the most effective areas.

Department of Commerce
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Retain the current functions of the Department of Commerce.</li><li>2. Office of Local Government (currently at the Budget and Control Board).</li></ol>



**Literary and Cultural Resources Restructuring Plan**

In 1991, the Commission on Government Restructuring recommended merging all four of our cultural and literary agencies into one agency. Unfortunately, the General Assembly did not include this change in its Restructuring Act of 1993. By contrast, the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources was formed in 1971 by combining the Office of Archives and History with the Office of Arts and Libraries, and it is charged with providing cultural, artistic, and historic resources

to the citizens of North Carolina in a unified manner. Our proposal is modeled after North Carolina's effective structure.

We believe our proposal will streamline these agencies and reduce administrative costs as follows:

#### **Department of Literary and Cultural Resources**

1. Create a Department of Literary and Cultural Resources and DLCR Board.
  - The DLCR Board would be responsible for appointing the director of the agency.
  - The DLCR Board should have equal representation from each of the four areas to ensure fair and balanced weight.
2. Division of Archives and History (currently the Department of Archives and History). **Savings: \$163,134.** We also propose moving the Institute for Archeology and Anthropology from USC to this division. **Savings: \$496,812.**
3. State Library. **Savings: \$90,472.**

#### **Consumer and Minority Protection Restructuring Plan**

In 2010, the General Assembly created the State Agency Restructuring Study Committee tasked with finding potential cost savings in various state agencies through consolidation. As part of that process, it was suggested that the Departments of Human and Consumer Affairs merge into the Attorney General's office. We believe this makes sense given the current budget shortfall.

The Department of Human Affairs is tasked with eliminating and preventing unlawful discrimination. To that end, Human Affairs cooperates with the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to investigate and prevent employment discrimination in South Carolina. Additionally, Human Affairs enforces the South Carolina Fair Housing Law. These functions could be handled by the Attorney General.

The Department of Consumer Affairs represents the interests of consumers and assists various law enforcement agencies – including the FBI, the U.S. Attorney and the South Carolina Attorney General – in protecting consumers in South Carolina. Unlike the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General, the Department of Consumer Affairs represents individual consumers and investigates individual complaints. As part of our restructuring proposal, we support expanding the Attorney General's office so they have the ability to handle individual complaints.

Likewise, during testimony before the Restructuring Study Committee in the fall of 2010, the South Carolina Commission for Minority Affairs suggested that if the agency had to be consolidated, they would prefer to be merged into Governor's Office of Executive Policy and Programs. Given the extraordinary budget shortfall, we agree with this recommendation.



**Merge Consumer and Human Affairs into the Attorney General's Office; Merge Minority Affairs into Governor's Office.**

1. Merge the Departments of Consumer and Human Affairs into the Attorney General's Office.
  - The expanded Attorney General's office would be responsible for investigating and enforcing the laws that the Departments of Consumer and Human Affairs currently enforce.
2. Merge the Commission for Minority Affairs into the Governor's Office of Executive Policy and Programs.

**State Trust Fund Authority**

South Carolina currently maintains a number of internal service funds that manage various risks related to public buildings, torts, medical malpractice, automobile use by public employees, health and disability, and workers' compensation, each of which is operated independently of the others. These funds include the Insurance Reserve Fund, Employee Insurance Programs Fund, State Accident Fund, Patients' Compensation Fund, Medical Malpractice Liability Insurance Joint Underwriting Association, and the Second Injury Fund.

We propose unifying the Insurance Reserve Fund, which manages the state's property and tort liability risks, and the State Accident Fund, which manages the state's workers' compensation risks. The risks managed by these funds are sufficiently related that they should be administered under the authority of one agency. The creation of a Trust Fund Authority will eliminate duplicative overhead costs and will allow the coordinated management of these funds, while decreasing the risk of funds being used for non-prescribed activities. Other funds could be added to the State Trust Fund Authority over time. The State Trust Fund Authority administrator would be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the Senate.

**State Trust Fund Authority**

1. State Accident Fund.
2. Insurance Reserve Fund.



### Create a Sunset Commission

**Government programs, once launched, never disappear. Actually, a government bureau is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this earth!**

– Ronald Reagan

To help mitigate the negative effects of never-ending government programs, we recommend establishing a sunset commission. According to the National Council of State Legislatures, “the sunset process was one of the first government accountability tools, dating back to the mid-1970s. Although individual sunset processes differ from state to state, a key feature of most processes is the inclusion of an automatic termination clause in the authorizing legislation for a particular state agency or program. Colorado was the first state to implement a sunset review process (in 1976), and within five years, more than two thirds of the states followed suit.”

Sunset Commission recommendations, if adopted, can lead to significant taxpayer savings. For example, Texas enacted one of our country’s most progressive sunset programs in 1977. Under the Texas Sunset Advisory Commission statute, the charter of nearly every state agency generally expires every 12 years, unless renewed by the Legislature. The sunset commission reviews each agency on a 12-year cycle – one agency is reviewed each year. The Commission assesses each agency’s structure and function and recommends that the Legislature re-charter the agency under its current operation, alter the agency’s operations, merge the agency with a similar agency, or eliminate the agency altogether and transfer its functions elsewhere. Between 1982 and 2009, \$28.6 million dollars was spent administering the Sunset Commission. Over that same period, however, the Texas Legislature adopted \$783.7 million dollars in suggested cuts made by the Sunset Commission – abolishing 58 agencies and consolidating 12 others. In other words, as needless bureaucracy has been cut, the taxpayers have seen a return of \$27 for every dollar spent in administering the Sunset Commission.

The remarkable success of the sunset commission in Texas provides an excellent model for our state government. In those states, the commissions yielded tremendous benefits to taxpayers, especially through the lower cost of government services. Remarkably, neither state collects an income tax, but both states operate with extraordinarily low per capita expenditures.<sup>5</sup>

South Carolina officials interested in running our government more effectively and more efficiently have a lot to learn from the experiences of Texas, among other states. A South Carolina Sunset Commission could identify and eliminate waste in government agencies, while improving the quality and lowering the costs of government services. We strongly believe that a regular review of existing state agencies will provide substantial benefits to our taxpayers.

---

<sup>5</sup> According to *Governing Magazine’s 2006 Source Book*, Florida’s and Texas’s per capita expenditures are \$4,334 and \$4,030 per person, respectively. Comparatively, the United States average is \$5,406 per person, while South Carolina spends \$5,058 per person.


Innovate Education

## Innovate Education

**The direction in which education starts a man will determine his future life.**

– Plato, *The Republic*

For the last three decades, South Carolina has funneled increasing amounts of money into its public education system. While the K-12 student population in South Carolina has grown 11 percent from FY 1992-93 to FY 2008-09, the real total spending, adjusted for inflation, has grown 85.6 percent. Over the same time period, South Carolina has consistently performed poorly on the SAT compared to other states.



Albert Einstein once said that insanity is, “doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.” In South Carolina, we clearly fit this definition of insanity as it pertains to our education system. Although we have made many changes over the years – such as creating the Offices of Public School Choice at the state Department of Education – it remains to be seen whether these initiatives will propel our students forward in global competition. We know that incremental funding increases are not enough, and we must focus our energy on developing an educational system that makes the most of the available funding and meets students’ needs.

### **Challenges in Student Performance**

Parents send their children to school with the expectation that their children will be ready for the challenges ahead. Unfortunately, state and national assessment scores show that a majority of our state's students across grade levels and across subjects are not adequately prepared for the following year. This state of affairs is unacceptable in today's highly competitive world.

Recently the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) released its findings for the 2009 study of education in industrialized countries. The United States ranked 25<sup>th</sup> in math out of 74 countries, and don't break the top 15 in science or reading either. Eight of the countries ranking in the top 10 were located in the Asia-Pacific region. As we have mentioned, South Carolina consistently ranks toward the bottom within the United States, and our country isn't doing exceptionally well when compared to other nations. It is critical that South Carolina's education system improve for the state to be able to compete in the global marketplace.

### ***Falling Short of the 2010 Goal***

In 1998, the Education Accountability Act (EAA) set the ambitious goal that South Carolina's student achievement would be ranked in the top half of states in five target areas by 2010. Although student performance has improved since that time, the students' scores on current rate of progress on the NAEP, SAT/ACT, on-time graduation rate, closing achievement gaps, and Advanced Placement programs is insufficient to reach EAA's goal.

Here's a look at where we are now on each of the five target areas outlined in the EAA:

#### **1. National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP)**

Although students have raised scores, reading gains in fourth and eighth grades have been flat and remain several percentage points below the national average. According to the most recent data, only 23 percent of our eighth-grade students are proficient on the writing portion of NAEP, well below the national average. Our fourth-grade math scores are ranked 39<sup>th</sup> nationally, while our eighth-grade math scores place us 34<sup>th</sup>. Nationally we are ranked 37<sup>th</sup> in fourth-grade reading and 42<sup>nd</sup> in eighth-grade reading, and our ranking among Southeastern states in reading remains much closer to the bottom than the top.

NAEP Math Results 2009: Ranking of Southeastern States				
State	4th Grade	Rank	8th Grade	Rank
North Carolina	244	1	284	2
Virginia	243	2	286	1
Florida	242	3	279	4
Kentucky	239	4	279	4
Arkansas	238	5	276	7
<b>South Carolina</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>3</b>
Georgia	236	6	278	6
Tennessee	232	8	275	8
Louisiana	229	9	272	9
Alabama	228	10	296	10
Mississippi	227	11	265	11

NAEP Math Results 2009: Ranking of Southeastern States				
State	4th Grade	Rank	8th Grade	Rank
North Carolina	244	1	284	2
Virginia	243	2	286	1
Florida	242	3	279	4
Kentucky	239	4	279	4
Arkansas	238	5	276	7
<b>South Carolina</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>3</b>
Georgia	236	6	278	6
Tennessee	232	8	275	8
Louisiana	229	9	272	9
Alabama	228	10	296	10
Mississippi	227	11	265	11

## 2. SAT/ACT

For more than three decades, South Carolina has hovered at or near the bottom in regional and national rankings for our SAT scores – a key indicator of whether a student is adequately prepared for college. We consistently rank last among the 11 Southeastern states, and well below the national average.

State	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Kentucky	5	3*	5	4	4	1	1
Tennessee	3*	1	1	1	1	2	2
Arkansas	3*	5	2	3*	2	3	3
Mississippi	7	3*	6	5	3	4	4
Louisiana	1*	2	3	3*	5	5	5
Alabama	1	6	4	6	6	6	6
Virginia	6	7	7	7	7	7	7
North Carolina	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Florida	9	9	9	9*	9	9	9
Georgia	10	10*	10	9*	10	10	10
<b>South Carolina</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10*</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>
							*Tie

Some argue that South Carolina allows more students to take the SAT than other states, which results in a lower average score. However, a greater percentage of students in Georgia and Virginia take the SAT than South Carolina, yet these states consistently have higher SAT scores. In fact, there are more than twice as many students in Georgia and Virginia that took the 2010 SAT than students in South Carolina – yet average test scores in Georgia and Virginia were higher than in South Carolina. During the past five years, South Carolina’s composite reading and math score has remained virtually constant while the Southeastern average has slightly increased. Currently, we fall 57 points below the national average of 1,509. This year’s scores ranked 49<sup>th</sup> among all states, ahead of only Maine, which requires all students to take the SAT.

### 3. Advanced Placement (AP)


South Carolina ranks in the top half of all states in AP participation and in the percentage of exams that earn a passing score, meeting the EAA goal. Between 2006 and 2010, the number of AP exam takers in South Carolina’s public schools increased by 36.6 percent. Over the last year, 15,802 exams in the state scored high enough to earn college credit – a 5.6 percent increase over last year. While there remains a significant gap along racial lines in terms of participation – approximately 73 percent of AP participants were Caucasian and 16 percent were African – the number of AP exams qualifying for college credit increased 2.5 percent among African-Americans taking exams compared to 2.3 percent for Caucasian students taking the exam.

### 4. Graduation Rate

Year after year, high school graduation rates in South Carolina are unacceptably low. However, there has been some progress over the years in the state’s high school graduation rates. According to this year’s Adequate Yearly Progress reports, approximately 73.7 percent of ninth grade high school students in 2005 graduated in 2009, up from 71.2 percent for the Class of 2007. Nonetheless, individual districts in the state vary greatly from the 73.7 percent average. For instance, 84.8 percent of Lexington 5’s Class of 2009 graduated on time while only 54.1 percent of Hampton 2’s Class of 2009 graduated on time. We must continue our efforts to ensure South

Carolina's high school students are equipped to succeed no matter where they live. While 66.4 percent of our state's ninth grade class graduated in 2009, the percentage of our state population that has graduated from high school is still below the U.S. average as the chart below demonstrates.

**School Year 2008-2009 National High School Completion Rate**




## 5. Achievement Gap


It is completely unacceptable that only nine percent of African-American eighth-graders are proficient in reading, while 35 percent of Caucasian eighth-graders are proficient (which is unacceptable in its own right) in this same subject according to the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). Although the achievement gap did not get significantly worse between 2003 and 2009, there is still roughly a 30-point difference between African-American and Caucasian students' NAEP scores in fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math. Additionally, in 2010 there was approximately a 100-point difference between the reading, math, and writing scores of African-American and Caucasian students on the SAT. According to the Alliance on Excellent Education, more than \$2.6 billion would be added to South Carolina's economy by 2020 if minority students graduated at the same rate as Caucasian students.

### Achievement Gap - NAEP Scores 2009

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics



### 2010 SAT Scores by Ethnicity



Source: College Board




### *The Need for Postsecondary Education*

For many years, South Carolinians were able to find decent paying jobs in manufacturing or other industries, which required only a high school diploma. Today, our citizens need more than a high school diploma to find a job in our competitive world. Nearly 22,000 students did not graduate from high school in South Carolina in 2009. Our low high school graduation rates negatively affect our state in other ways as well. First, students who take longer to graduate represent increased costs for the state for each year they remain in the system (the average cost to educate one student in our state is \$11,651 per year, \$12,849 when revenues from bond issues are included). Second, students who drop out to pursue the General Educational Development diploma (GED) and do not continue on to attain an associate's degree are more likely to rely on the state's social services. Third, low-skilled workers have reduced earning potential, which lowers their quality of life. According to the Alliance for Excellent Education, \$5.7 billion in lifetime earnings is lost in South Carolina for the 22,000 students of the Class of 2009 who dropped out. Lastly, the state spends more than \$320 million in health care costs for high school dropouts over the course of the dropouts' lives. Much more needs to be done to equip students to finish high school on time and succeed in the postsecondary world.

### *Spending More, Getting Less*

Adjusted for inflation, education spending in our state has increased 85.6 percent since 1993. During that same period, student population has grown by approximately 11 percent. Despite increased education spending at a rate faster than the national average over the years, our high school completion rate has seen no significant improvements and fewer of our public schools are meeting federal yearly progress goals.

Throwing increasing amounts of money into a flawed system will not change the quality of our system's educational product. We believe that focusing more money into the classrooms would go a long way toward achieving our progress goals.



### **Providing a 21<sup>st</sup>-Century Education**

If we expect our students to compete in an ever-changing global society, then we must equip them with a 21st-century education. Providing such an education will ultimately require that we implement major reforms to improve the educational system. A key element in separating an average school system from a great one is the culture of low expectations that allows students, parents, teachers, and other stakeholders to accept mediocrity. We believe that taking a hard look at our education system is long overdue, and we understand that mediocrity is not good enough. In order to move toward offering a comprehensive 21st-century education program, we propose the following six initiatives:

1. Provide school choice through scholarships and charter schools
2. Offer students incentives to succeed
3. Consolidate school districts and services
4. Reform the education funding formula and get more dollars to the classroom
5. Offer merit pay for teachers
6. Upgrade the public school transportation system

#### **1. Offer choices to students in the lowest-performing schools**

The vast majority of American students remain in government-assigned public schools, and the majority of South Carolina's students are assigned to a particular public school because of the students' zip code. Unfortunately, only 16 percent of schools in our state were rated "Excellent" according to the 2009 School District Report Cards issued by the Education Oversight Committee. By contrast, 21 percent of schools in South Carolina were rated "Unsatisfactory" or "Below Average." Although the Report Card is not the tell-all indicator of a school's success, it goes to show that there is wide disparity in the quality of education offered in South Carolina. Until we can ensure that every student has access to high-quality instruction, parents should have the freedom to enroll their children in a program that gets the results they need.

Recognizing that our neediest students deserve more choices, the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) has recommended school choice programs be provided to students in chronically underperforming schools. For schools that have received three years of technical assistance funding (due to an "Unsatisfactory" or "Below Average" Report Card) and do not improve in the Absolute Rating on their annual School Report Card, students in these schools will be allowed to transfer to a different public school with a higher Absolute Rating. The child's district of residence would provide to the receiving district an amount equal to the receiving district's per-pupil revenues. A South Carolina Department of Education report released to the EOC in October 2008 identified 151 schools with "persistent underperformance." These schools had an Absolute rating of "Unsatisfactory" or "Below Average" for the years 2004 to 2007.

We fully support the EOC's prior recommendation and give the EOC credit for putting students' needs ahead of any other consideration. The EOC's recommendation also supports our notion of "backpacking" funds, which allows money to follow the child to the school he or she chooses.

Additionally, we believe the freedom of choice can be provided through education scholarships targeted at the student populations that are least likely to receive high-quality education services.

These scholarships should support students with special needs, low-income students, students enrolled in failing schools, or students who score “Below Basic” on any component of the state standardized exam. We believe that, until parents have the flexibility to control where and how their children are educated, our ability to create a high-quality system will be limited.

Many other states are giving parents the flexibility they demand for their children’s education. Ten states and the District of Columbia have policies that provide taxpayer-funded scholarships to help students attend private elementary or secondary schools of choice: Georgia, Arizona, Florida, Louisiana, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Delaware, Utah, and Wisconsin. Seven states offer incentives for contributions to scholarship programs or allow tax credits or deductions for education expenses, including private school tuition: Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island.

The chart below describes a few of the choice programs that have been implemented in other states:


Publicly-Funded Education Scholarships in the United States	
State	Description
<b>Vermont</b>	<p>Town Tuitioning – When students choose to attend public schools, the sending town pays the receiving school district an amount equal to the receiving district’s average per-pupil costs.</p> <p>When students attend private schools, the voucher is worth up to the average announced tuition for public schools, calculated each year by the state.</p>
<b>Maine</b>	<p>Town Tuitioning – According to the Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice, “Public schools in Maine have a ‘tuition rate’ that sending towns must pay when their students are tuitioned at public schools. For private schools, sending towns provide a voucher good for up to Maine’s average per-pupil cost for secondary education in the previous year, plus what is known as the Insured Value Factor, an additional payment intended to cover depreciation of private schools’ buildings. Parents may supplement this voucher with their own money. The values of these vouchers vary from county to county based on current per-student funding levels. Sending towns have the option of increasing the voucher to as high as 115 percent of the per-student funding, but may not reduce the voucher below that rate.” Maine began Town Tuitioning in 1873 and in 1981 passed legislation to prevent religious schools from participating.</p> <p>In 2009, 13,739 students were tuitioned. Of these 5,452 were tuitioned at public schools and 8,287 at private schools.</p>

<b>Florida</b>	McKay Scholarship – A student with a disability whose parent(s) is dissatisfied with the assigned public school can receive the full amount of funds for which he or she would have been eligible under the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) – used to attend another school. For the 2009-10 school year, the average scholarship amount was \$6,519.
	Corporate Tax Credit – Corporations receive tax credits for contributions to Scholarship Tuition Organizations. Credits are limited to 75 percent of a corporation’s tax liability.
	Opportunity Scholarships – Scholarships up to \$3,500 to attend private school or \$500 to change public schools. Scholarships are limited to students in schools rated “F” on the Florida accountability system.
<b>Iowa</b>	Deduction – Families can deduct up to \$1,000 per child from their state income taxes for education expenses. Taxpayers using the standard deduction could take a tax credit of up to \$50 for education expenses for each child. Scholarships are limited to families earning less than \$45,000 per year.
	Tax Credit – Tax credit of 25 percent of the first \$1,000 spent on their children’s education.
<b>Illinois</b>	Tax Credit – Parents receive a tax credit worth up to 25 percent of annual education related expenses. Tax credits range from \$250 to \$500 per family.
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Milwaukee Parental Choice Program – Vouchers are worth the lesser of the full amount of private school tuition or \$6,000. Scholarships are limited to families earning less than 175 percent of the federal poverty level.
<b>Georgia</b>	Special Needs Scholarship – Begun in the 2008-09 school year, this scholarship allows K-12 students with special needs to transfer to another public school, a private school, or to one of Georgia’s three state schools for the deaf and blind. Scholarship amount depends on the type and severity of the disability.
	Tax Credit – Individuals or business can contribute donations to the Georgia Student Scholarship Organizations, which, in turn, provides scholarships for students to attend private schools.

Florida implemented education scholarships in 2001. After the first four years of implementation, several independent studies found that students who were offered scholarships outperformed other Florida public school students on state assessments.

Approximately 74 percent of students in Milwaukee’s school choice program – the nation’s largest and oldest program – graduate high school in four years, compared to 46 percent of students in Milwaukee’s public school system. The Milwaukee program has also achieved substantial savings for taxpayers.

### Milwaukee Parental Choice Enrollment



Source: Wisconsin Department of Education

Efforts to implement choice programs similar to those in Florida and Milwaukee have repeatedly stalled in the South Carolina General Assembly. Each year since 2003, there has been an effort to create an education scholarship program in South Carolina, and each year the effort failed to survive the legislative process.

The only school choice legislation to pass both the House and the Senate was the Open Enrollment Bill in 2007. Unfortunately, the bill was rife with capacity limitations and student transfer prioritization that combined to empower school districts and not students. We believe that this legislation failed in giving parents and students choices within the education system, and the bill likely would have had an insignificant impact on expanding choices for students most in need of improved educational options. As a result, this administration vetoed this legislation, which the General Assembly sustained.

Offering a combination of scholarships and tax credits could save millions of dollars in our state each year. South Carolina was among five states studied by the Cato Institute, which issued a report entitled “The Fiscal Impact of a Large-Scale Education Tax Credit Program.” The July 2008 report calculated that South Carolina could save \$1.1 billion over a 10-year period if the state operated on the Institute’s Public Education Tax Credit (PETC) model legislation.

Cato’s program is a combination of the tax-credit program in Illinois and the scholarship donation programs in Pennsylvania and Florida. In Illinois, families can claim up to a \$500 state income tax credit if they choose to send their children to private school. In states like Rhode Island, Arizona, Pennsylvania and Florida, children are benefiting from educational choice through the scholarship donation program that allows an individual or business to make a donation to a nonprofit agency.

In turn, that nonprofit distributes scholarship tuition assistance to low income families. Cato's PETC provides tax credits to parents who send their children to private schools, and to other taxpayers – including businesses – who donate money for scholarships. Under the PETC, the amount of tax credit parents can claim varies with the family's income, so there is a true incentive for low-income families.

The Cato report used a "Fiscal Impact Calculator" to determine the amount of per-pupil spending for the next 10 years, the number of students migrating to private schools, and the annual financial impact to the state and to districts. In the first year, per-pupil spending in South Carolina is estimated by the calculator at \$12,900 with 142,000 kids enrolled in private schools and 591,873 students enrolled in public schools. During year one, the state would save \$96 million, while districts would potentially lose \$26 million. However, to counter the districts' loss, the Legislature could appropriate state savings to the districts, resulting in total financial savings of \$67 million in year one alone. By year 10, the Fiscal Calculator assumes that more than half of the state's students would now be enrolled in private schools, thus resulting in a financial saving of \$1.1 billion.

**Cato Institute's Public Education Tax Credit Program**  
*Fiscal Impact on South Carolina*

Year	Public School Funding Per Pupil	Net State and District Impact
1	\$12,992	\$67,587,305
2	\$13,152	\$66,550,428
3	\$13,366	\$74,223,260
4	\$13,651	\$91,063,504
5	\$14,024	\$116,541,962
10	--	<b>Total Impact:</b> <b>\$1,080,516,318</b>

The issue of school choice has long been advocated by those who want to see true reform. Now, more and more peoples are realizing the potential positive impact that school choice can bring. In 2008, Reverend Al Sharpton, who had always opposed school choice, cited the continuously low achievement scores of African-Americans and Hispanics as the reason he has joined the choice movement. Rev. Sharpton eventually joined New York City Schools Chancellor Joel Klein in co-chairing the Education Equality Project, a non-partisan group advocating for more charter schools and greater accountability. State Democratic Senator Robert Ford has supported the school choice movement in South Carolina for similar reasons. Supporting charter schools is certainly a step in the right direction, and we hope that other influential leaders and lawmakers – in Congress and in our state General Assembly – will also begin to advocate for true school choice.

South Carolina does provide scholarships to four-year-olds through the Child Development Education Pilot Program. We would like to see this kind of scholarship extended to all students in our state to give them an opportunity for a quality education.

### ***South Carolina Public Charter School District***

In 1996, South Carolina's General Assembly recognized the need to offer parents more options in directing the quality of the education their child received. To fill this need, the General Assembly passed charter school legislation giving parents, educators, business leaders, and community members the flexibility to collaboratively create schools that offer innovative opportunities for students. As a result, South Carolina has been able to create a variety of charter schools.

Because some local school boards or district officials initially hindered these creative educational opportunities, we advocated for the creation of an alternative authorizer, the South Carolina Public Charter School District (SCPCSD), to offer prospective charter schools another sponsor. The SCPCSD, created in the spring of 2006, has a fully functioning Board of Trustees as well as district staff, and in the fall of 2007 it began receiving applications for prospective start-up charters. For the 2010-11 school year, there are 11 charter schools under the SCPCSD jurisdiction serving approximately 8,155 students – making SCPCSD larger than many public school districts.

In order to continue SCPCSD's work specifically, and the charter school movement generally, we request that school districts receive the funding necessary to offer applicants and approved charters the technical assistance and administrative support they need to become operational. For FY 2010-11, state funding for students in the SCPCSD is estimated at \$4,331 per student while that figure jumps to \$11,651 for traditional public school students – which receive local funds in addition to the state revenue. Our current funding level for SCPCSD is by far the lowest in the state and among the lowest in the country. We must do more to equalize funding for students enrolled in the charter school district.

## **2. Offer Students Incentives to Succeed**

For decades, South Carolina's high school seniors have expected their last year of high school to be full of social interaction with few academic challenges. This holds particularly true for students who earn most of their course credits prior to their senior year, allowing them to complete their required 24 credits long before they graduate. Some of these advanced students pursue dual enrollment courses for college credit while in high school, or they take a light course load so they can have free time to share with friends during their last year. Too many of our students are pursuing the latter option.

The "senior year off" mentality presents the state with two challenges. First, it creates an unnecessarily high cost to educate the student. Though the students aren't participating in a full course load, taxpayers are still paying for the full per-pupil expenditure of \$11,651. Second, the "senior year off" mentality potentially sets the students up for failure upon entering their first year of postsecondary education. By the time they graduate from high school, many students have not had math or science courses in over a year, which makes it difficult to draw upon these essential skills during their postsecondary studies.

Several states have found ways to address the senior-year inertia. Texas, Arizona, and Utah have all implemented early graduation scholarship programs. In Texas, the Early High School Graduation Scholarship Program rewards students who finish high school prior to the spring semester of their



senior year. Under the program, students receive a scholarship based on the amount of time spent in high school. The sooner they finish high school, the greater the scholarship they receive.

Texas Education Agency Early High School Graduation Scholarship	
Scholarship Amount	Requirements
\$3,000	Successfully complete high school curriculum in 36 consecutive months (spring of junior year) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graduate with at least 15 hours of college credit</li> </ul>
\$2,000	Successfully complete high school curriculum in 36 consecutive months (spring of junior year)
\$1,500	Successfully complete high school curriculum in 36 – 41 consecutive months (fall of senior year) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graduate with at least 30 hours of college credit</li> </ul>
\$1,000	Successfully complete the high school curriculum in 41 – 45 months (spring of senior year) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graduate with at least 30 hours of college credit</li> </ul>
\$500	Successfully complete the high school curriculum in 36 – 41 consecutive months (fall of senior year)

During the 2008-09 school year, more than 6,783 students in Texas earned the Early High School Graduation Scholarship.

This administration proposes implementing the **Palmetto Early Graduation Reward Program** for students who complete the required 24 credit hours before the spring semester of their senior year. Based on the Texas Early High School Scholarship Program, our program offers a reward to students who complete the required courses in a shorter period of time than the traditional four-year program. By extending student scholarships worth up to **\$2,000**, we provide students with incentives to focus on their individual graduation plans early in their secondary education, with the hopes that hard work can lead to a financial reward when they finish high school.

Palmetto Early Graduation Reward Program	
Scholarship Amount	Requirements
\$2,000	Complete South Carolina High School curriculum in <b>six</b> semesters
\$1,000	Complete South Carolina High School curriculum in <b>seven</b> semesters

We recommend the scholarships be paid with revenues that would have followed a student, who graduated earlier, during his or her senior year. During FY 2010-11, South Carolina schools received approximately \$11,651 per student, providing more than enough to fund fully this program starting with the senior class of 2012. In fact, if just 400 South Carolina seniors from the class of 2012 were to complete their coursework in six semesters, the state could realize a savings from per-pupil



expenditures of \$3.75 million. We hope the members of the General Assembly will consider legislation for this type of incentive.

### 3. Consolidate School Districts


District consolidation is a concept that has been underway in South Carolina for some time, and this administration believes that continued consolidation will create an efficient and equitable education system. Since 1950, the number of school districts in South Carolina has declined from 1,220 to 85 school districts shared by 46 counties in 2010 – not including the South Carolina Public Charter School District or the Palmetto Unified District, which serves the state’s inmates. Despite the reduction in the number of school districts, there remains wide variation in district size – ranging from approximately 71,000 students in Greenville County Schools down to fewer than 570 students in Marion School District Seven.

The presence of a large number of independent school districts produces the same inefficiencies as having a large number of independent state agencies, specifically in the form of duplicative and unnecessary administrative costs. For example, while Greenville County only has one school district, neighboring Anderson County has five separate school districts and Spartanburg County has a total of seven. More than half of our school districts have only one high school. An extensive study conducted by a team of consultants for the Education Oversight Committee in 2003 found that the cost per student demonstrates the inefficiency of smaller districts. The report said that districts rated “Unsatisfactory” are spending almost \$1,200 more per student than the districts rated “Excellent.” The underperforming districts spend too much on fixed costs for leadership and operational costs and not enough on teachers’ salaries or hiring better-qualified teachers. The study concluded that if districts would merely consolidate to reach a minimum population of 2,500 students, “we could save nearly **\$26 million** in administrative costs that could be spent directly for students in their classrooms.” Likewise, the Office of State Budget estimated fiscal savings from school consolidation to be \$26 million.

Recent examples of school or district consolidation in South Carolina have initially proven to bring more money to the classrooms. In 2008, our administration supported the consolidation of Sumter School Districts 2 and 17, which will complete their merger this year. In Union County, the school board voted in the spring of 2007 to combine the county’s three high schools under one roof. Students from the small schools of Jonesville and Lockhart – which served fewer than 250 high school students each – were sent to the campus of Union High School, creating Union County High School. While this merger initially caused the smaller towns to feel that they were losing their identity, district officials estimate \$1 million in savings in the first year after consolidation by not operating the facilities of the smaller high schools.

Unnecessary expenditures on school administrative functions decrease the effectiveness of taxpayers’ investment in education. While we are optimistic that financial and economic realities will increase the number of districts that consolidate, in the mean time, individual districts must become more effective at reducing administrative costs.

**Spending on K-12 Administration per \$1000 of Personal Income**



Other states are already realizing the effect that shared services have in driving more of the educational dollar into the classroom.

- Dallas and Houston Independent school districts pooled resources to purchase health insurance and to reduce duplicative administrative overhead in procuring employee health benefits.
- Rural districts in Texas reduced accounting costs by 50 percent per year by sharing accounting and payroll services.
- Through cooperative purchasing, the Shared Services Program in Middlesex County, New Jersey, contributed to a five percent savings on electricity for public buildings during the first year of the program by reducing costs on water/wastewater programs and by purchasing natural gas, electricity, equipment, services, and supplies.
- Lawrence-area Massachusetts school districts banded together to provide special education services, saving taxpayers approximately \$13 million over the next two decades.

Sharing services need not be limited to school districts. District offices should consider sharing services with other local, municipal, county, and regional agencies as well as private providers.

1. The Lincoln Unified School District in Stockton, CA created a mutually beneficial contract with a private fitness center operator to build an exercise facility at a newly-planned school. The fitness center's clients use the facility

in the morning and evening – outside of school hours – granting the school access to the facility during the school day.

2. Since the early 1980s, the Northville Parks and Recreation Department in Michigan and the local public schools have engaged in a joint services contract where the public schools allow the department to use their facilities to provide youth and senior citizen recreational services.

In South Carolina, potential service partners include school districts, schools, municipalities, nonprofits, and privately owned businesses. In 2006, the South Carolina Education Reform Council’s report to the Governor supported this idea by recommended that South Carolina provide “a structure and regulatory authorization for districts and schools to readily share resources developed for school districts with other community organizations or businesses for their needs, when those resources are not being used by the school.”

In 2005, the General Assembly created the School District Study Committee to evaluate the size of school districts in our state and make recommendations on optimum district size. The study committee issued its report in January 2006 and concluded that the school districts could realize a cost savings of more than \$21.1 million by consolidating management functions that occur at the school, district, and regional levels.

<b>Expenditures on District and Program Management 2005</b>		
<b>School District</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>Per-pupil Expenditure</b>
Dillon	913	\$374
Barnwell 19	946	\$685
Barnwell 29	981	\$302
Marion 7	984	\$457
McCormick	1,028	\$836
Bamberg 2	1,078	\$1,008
Richland 1	25,909	\$161
Berkeley	26,998	\$161
Horry	31,036	\$104
Charleston	43,161	\$287
Greenville	63,313	\$112
State Average		\$277

Achieving the savings discussed by the study committee does not require drastic changes in services, nor does it require increased oversight on the part of the State Department of Education or the General Assembly. By simply requiring that districts limit per-pupil expenditures on the District Management Level and the Program Management Level to the lowest average expenditure for each county, the General Assembly can force districts to consolidate governance and services, or offset per-pupil expenditures on District and Program Management Level activities with local operating funding.

In light of our state’s budget shortfall, and in order to maximize the dollars that get to the classrooms, we support funding only one office of district-level administrators per county. For example, Charleston County serves nearly 44,000 students and yet has one superintendent, as well as chief administrators for instruction, finance, and human resources. In Spartanburg County, which serves approximately the same number of students, there are seven districts – each with its own superintendent and administrative staff. Paying for seven separate school districts is an incredible waste of money, particularly given our current economic situation. We support funding administrative salaries for only one district office per county, and we encourage districts to pay for additional administrators if they choose to continue operating multiple school districts per county.

To encourage more consolidations, in the past this administration has recommended offering incentives to districts that consolidate voluntarily. Education Superintendent Jim Rex appointed a

Task Force on Funding for World Class Learning in 2007. We basically agreed with the Task Force's proposals, with a few minor modifications:

1. Allow consolidated districts to receive general state aid at the level of the district receiving the most aid prior to consolidating for two years after merger.
2. Allow consolidated districts to receive state grants to compensate for any difference in teacher salaries, so that salaries for all teachers are increased to the same level. This should be allowed for a three-year period following the merger.
3. Allow consolidated districts to receive a one-time grant to cover a portion of the negative fund balance that any district brings into the consolidation.
4. Allow consolidated districts to receive a "hold harmless" on the district report card rating for a period of three years following consolidation, with individual schools receiving report card ratings as usual.

However, given the dismal budget year that the state is experiencing, we are no longer in a position to offer incentives to districts to consolidate. This year we recommend that the state pay for one administrative position of each type per county. If the county does not wish to consolidate positions, that is their choice, but the state will only cover the cost of one. Each additional position must be funded 100 percent by the county. It is simply not fair to ask for counties with only one school district to accept a reduction in state funds, so counties with multiple districts can continue to operate under an inefficient model. In economic times like these it is essential that as much funding as possible reach the students in the classroom and get siphoned off by administrators at the district office.

#### 4. Our "Funding the Child" Proposal

Our current funding system has dozens of spending categories, making it difficult for school districts to create innovative, student-based programs. The present system also places limits on what districts can purchase, while imposing cumbersome accounting management for administrators. Ultimately, we need a funding system that focuses on the student, not one that focus on programs.

Last year, the state's Board of Economic Advisors estimated that we spend \$11,651 per pupil, an increase of 56 percent since FY 2003-04; yet we have still seen no dramatic student achievement gains. Our focus should not necessarily be on *how much* we are spending on education, but rather on whether the activities we are funding produce positive results.

We support a system of funding that adheres to the following principles:

- Allow funds to follow children to whichever school they attend;
- Tie funding levels to the individual needs of the child;
- Ensure school funding arrives at the schools in the form of real dollars and not as staff positions or teaching ratios; and
- Simplify the funding system, make it more transparent, and make it more accountable to taxpayers.

This administration supports a simplified funding stream for schools that is based on an updated Education Finance Act formula including factors for family income and student ability. Schools should be given the flexibility to select and purchase the services they believe best meet students' needs.

Our proposal would not only allow greater spending flexibility for districts, but also greater transparency for the public. Our funding plan allows parents and taxpayers to find out how funds are spent at the school level via a user-friendly online database.

The "Funding-the-Child" approach has gained broad support across the country. School districts in Cincinnati, Milwaukee, and Houston are using various aspects of this model. In Oakland, CA, the shift to weighted student funding has led to a redistribution of the best qualified teachers to the schools that need academic improvement most. Moving to a more simplified funding system has been proven to address funding inequalities, reduce the perverse incentives created by programmatic funding, and force schools and districts to focus on students' needs rather than sustaining existing bureaucracies.

Our proposal will also fulfill our education budget's primary objective: focus more dollars directly to the classroom. In the last two legislative sessions, the General Assembly temporarily gave school districts more flexibility to allocate funding as the school districts thought best. We are pleased to see that the General Assembly is giving local school districts more authority over how education funding is spent, but several programs are excluded from the flexibility proviso:

<b>Programs Excluded from the Flexibility Proviso</b>
◆ EEDA 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Career Awareness
◆ EEDA Career Specialists
◆ Child Development Education Pilot Program
◆ School Employer Contributions
◆ National Board Certification Salary Supplement
◆ Teacher of the Year Awards
◆ Teacher Salary Increase
◆ EAA Technical Assistance

We propose that the multiple funding streams be consolidated, giving the districts spending flexibility. Until that happens, we support continuing the Funding Flexibility Proviso with three modifications:

- Public schools – rather than districts – should be given the flexibility to reallocate resources;
- Rather than focusing on increasing instructional spending, hold schools accountable for results on a nationally-recognized norm-referenced test; and

- Reduce the list of programs excluded from this flexibility so that Education Accountability Act funding may be reallocated based on school-level managerial decisions.

In addition to extending the scope of the Funding Flexibility Proviso, we propose that the General Assembly enact a permanent statute to provide school districts more flexibility in how they spend the allocated funds. This proposal, Streamlined Management and Accounting Resources for Teaching (SMART) Funding, would put more education spending decisions in the hands of the communities. First introduced in 2003, SMART Funding legislation has yet to survive both legislative houses. We continue to support SMART Funding legislation and hope that the General Assembly works to enact this much needed reform.

## **5. Reward Teachers for Positive Performance**

School districts in our state seek to find the best and brightest teaching workforce to instruct and enlighten young minds. Offering competitive pay is one way to reward teachers for their dedicated service. This administration realizes the effect that teacher's salaries has on the ability of school leadership to recruit and retain high-quality teachers, which is why South Carolina has been aggressive in raising the average teacher salary.

In past executive budgets, we have supported raising teacher pay in South Carolina to at least \$300 above the Southeastern average during years when sufficient funding is available. Even though this year's budget cuts have allowed us only to maintain teacher salaries, we believe the current system of pay is unconnected to the quality of the service a teacher offers.

Like employees in many other industries, teachers respond to the incentives placed before them. Merit pay, commonly referred to as "pay for performance" or "diversified compensation systems," is a way to reward teachers' success. Several urban areas have implemented pay-for-performance plans, and states are now moving forward with merit pay plans of their own. In 2007, Arkansas enacted the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program (REAP) Act. The two-year pilot allowed up to 12 public school districts, schools, or charter schools to receive a grant for alternative teacher compensation.

In Denver, the ProComp program for public schools was introduced in 1999, and more than 3,430 teachers are currently enrolled in the program. The ProComp system is a results-based pay system that uses multiple criteria to assess a teacher's performance. Teachers do not receive a salary bonus until they demonstrate improvement on the criteria specified in the four specific areas.

Components of the Denver ProComp Pay System		
	Criteria	Bonus Amount (Percent of Index, based on \$37,551 salary in 2010)
Knowledge and Skills	Professional Development Units	\$751 (2 percent )
	Graduate Degree/National Certificate	\$3,380 (9 percent )
	Tuition Reimbursement	\$1,000 (3 percent)
Professional Evaluation	Probationary	\$376 (1 percent )
	Non-probationary	\$1,127 (3 percent every 3 years)
Student Growth	Meeting Annual Objectives	\$376 (1 percent )
	Exceeding Student Performance Expectations	\$2,403 (6.4 percent )
	Distinguished Schools	\$2,403 (6.4 percent)
Market Incentives	Hard to Staff Position	\$2,403 (6.4 percent )
	Hard to Staff Schools	\$2,403 (6.4 percent )

The Denver ProComp system reflects current knowledge about merit-pay systems. First, teachers must not be forced to participate in the program. ProComp allows teachers to opt-into the program over a seven-year period or to continue with the traditional teacher salary schedule that bases salary increases on years of experience accompanied with inflationary adjustments. However, all new teachers are automatically enrolled in the program. This approach balances the fact that teachers new to the profession – either as first-time entrants into the workforce or as career changers – are generally more receptive to merit pay as a way to increase their pay based on demonstrated proficiencies.

Second, the ProComp system takes into account the fact that teachers are able to demonstrate proficiency in several areas, all of which can ultimately improve the quality of student instruction. An ambitious teacher, for instance, might pursue salary bonuses in all four measurement areas, increasing his or her salary nearly \$10,000 in a school year.

In 2006 and 2007, South Carolina was awarded more than \$41 million by the U.S. Department of Education to create the South Carolina Teacher Incentive Fund (SCTIF). In 2010, South Carolina received more than \$47 million by the U.S. Department of Education. The SCTIF supports South Carolina's Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), a school-wide pay for performance-based system that is based on a national TAP model that has been modified to fit our state's needs. The TAP program builds on four elements that include merit-based compensation, multiple career paths for teachers, ongoing professional growth, and instructionally-focused accountability, and currently exists in 63 schools in 14 districts throughout South Carolina. Once the grant is fully implemented in the spring of 2011, there will be 71 schools in 16 districts participating in the program. We are seeing positive results from schools participating in the TAP program. Over the last two years, students in TAP schools have outperformed students in non-TAP schools by 2.5 standard deviations in 2008-9 and 1.5 standard deviations in 2009-10 (anything above 1.0 standard deviations is considered statistically significant).



Teachers in participating schools are eligible to receive salary bonuses ranging from \$2,000 to \$10,000 based on classroom observations, improved student achievement in their respective classrooms, or school-wide performance improvements. In fact, our TAP program is so successful that Minnesota Governor Tim Pawlenty based his state's teacher incentive program on South Carolina's TAP model.

Additionally, the program is improving teacher turnover. In 2008, a survey of 10 schools that have TAP averaged a 33 percent improvement in teacher turnover. One highlight is at Bell Street Middle School in Laurens District 56. Before Bell Street implemented TAP in 2002, the average teacher turnover rate hovered around 40 percent. The turnover rate dropped to about 30 percent during the first year of TAP and has remained below 10 percent during the past three years.

State-level investment in National Board Certification Salary bonuses is an area where we believe the state's investment in teacher pay could be better used toward fulfilling our goal of raising student achievement. Even though the General Assembly limited this program's enrollment and funding amounts during the last legislative session, we are committed to honoring the work of teachers who have already completed the certification program. However, expanding the program beyond its current participation level limits the state's ability to invest in raising teacher pay in a manner that has a real impact on student achievement. We support the Education Oversight Committee's recommendation of discontinuing the state supplement for National Board Certification after all current obligations are met.

Going forward, we recommend that the funds currently devoted to National Board Certification salary bonuses should be set aside for a performance-based bonus program. Specifically, we propose targeting these funds toward block grants that can be used by school districts to establish merit-pay programs similar to the TAP model.

If the General Assembly continues the National Board Certification program, we suggest linking the incentives with agreeing to teach in hard-to-staff schools to help struggling schools improve the quality of teachers. This proposal was made by the Democratic Leadership Council in a 2004 report.

## **6. Transportation**

The costs associated with student transportation continue to be one of the largest direct expenditures made by the Department of Education. South Carolina is the only state with a centralized school bus service and purchasing arrangement, and over 25 percent of our buses are more than 16 years old.

In 2006, the state Department of Education's Director of Transportation received a memo from the TransPar Group – a professional organization that helps schools resolve transportation issues – highlighting the efficiencies the state Department of Education would gain by leasing a portion of its buses from a private provider rather than making outright purchases. By leasing buses, the Department of Education would reduce the time it will take to get to the industry standard of maintaining an average vehicle fleet age of seven years by 25 percent, while also reducing overall maintenance costs. The strategy recommended by TransPar included using \$9 million out of the \$36 million in annual bus purchase appropriations to lease 1,000 new buses rather than using the



entire amount to purchase only 475 new buses – a cost savings of \$27 million. Given that the average life of a school bus is 15 years, we could send students to school in newer buses at a lower cost with a shorter replacement cycle by leasing.

We also recommend that the Department consider using buses that run on alternative fuels. The hybrid buses get almost double the miles per gallon compared to traditional diesel buses. Alternative fuels might present a more efficient and cost-effective means of transportation.

### **Conclusion**

This administration's education proposal is simple: give students the tools they need to get the best possible education. Although we have made progress in some areas over the last few years, we still lag behind in many critical areas. As the number of progressive and innovative educational programs continues to increase around the country, we simply cannot afford to rely on our present system to improve our competitiveness. We believe our proposals will equip South Carolina's students to excel among students from other states, across the nation, and beyond.

Emphasize Economic  
Development

## Emphasize Economic Development

**The world is changing very fast. Big will not beat small anymore. It will be the fast beating the slow.**

– Rupert Murdoch

South Carolina continues to face persistent competition from all over the world. As the above quote implies, those who respond to this change quickly will be the most adept at competing in the ever-evolving global marketplace. In spite of all the challenges our state faces, we continue to succeed in attracting new business while allowing existing businesses to grow and compete in Thomas Friedman's "Flat World."

South Carolina is recognized consistently for its business climate by one of the nation's leaders in providing site selection and corporate relocation services. In 2010, the Pollina Corporation again named South Carolina among "America's Top Ten Pro-Business States." This study honored South Carolina for its progressive, pro-business policies that result in job growth. The state has been ranked among the top five states in the Pollina study each of the past seven years and ranked fourth this year. The continued efforts by this administration and the Department of Commerce to make South Carolina a better place to do business is at the root of this success, as the state continues to enjoy yet another year of record levels of capital investment and job creation for South Carolinians.

To have a clear understanding of where we are headed as a state, we must have an equally clear understanding of where we have been over the past several years. Since 2003, the Department of Commerce has been incredibly successful in attracting new businesses and industries to South Carolina and improving our business environment for the businesses and industries that were already here. During the last eight years, Commerce has completed 1,000 economic development projects, which created more than 101,000 jobs and \$20.145 billion in new capital investment. Likewise, the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism has partnered with private companies to provide taxpayers with hundreds of thousands of dollars in added value through better state park amenities and tourism promotions. PRT has also won several awards for tourism, stewardship, and conservation. Most notably, after re-opening the Charles Towne Landing Historic Site in 2006, PRT won the 2007 Southeast Tourism Society Travel Attraction of the Year award – all while increasing efficiency and saving money. We would like to highlight several of our executive agencies' big accomplishments during the last several years:

- In 2010, *Area Development* magazine ranked South Carolina as the third most attractive state for businesses. South Carolina was first in lowest business costs and third in most business friendly, corporate tax environment, overall labor climate, workforce development programs and fast-track permitting.
- The Economic Development Competitiveness Act of 2010 was signed in order to continue expanding South Carolina's economy and create jobs. The law is aimed at cutting tax rates for many industrial

buildings, broadening and modernizing investment tax credits, and making incentive programs based solely on economic criteria. It also reforms the Endowed Chairs program to help shift the focus to research that aligns with private industry needs.


- *Site Selection* magazine ranked South Carolina fifth in the United States for its Business Climate, one of eight southern states in the top 10 in 2010.
- South Carolina ranked first in the United States for private-industry manufacturing employment in foreign-affiliated companies in 2010.
- *Conde Nast Traveler* magazine ranked Charleston second among the nation's top 10 travel destinations in the United States in 2010. Kiawah Island was named the top island resort in North America in 2010.
- *Chief Executive* Magazine and CNBC both ranked South Carolina in the top 10 states for business. South Carolina ranked seventh in the nation in the Small Business Survival Index for 2009. North Carolina and Georgia ranked 39<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> respectively.
- Commerce reduced the number of its divisions from 14 to nine, thereby eliminating unnecessary layers of management while enhancing efficiency and improving the agency's focus;
- PRT reorganized itself internally, reducing unnecessary personnel by 53 employees and becoming 78 percent self-sufficient by 2009 – resulting in a combined savings of \$14.35 million and ranking in the top 10 among self-sufficient systems in the nation;
- In 2003, Commerce established a Small Business Ombudsman, creating a single point of contact for entrepreneurs and small business owners. The Ombudsman's Office has assisted more than 3,200 small businesses and larger companies;
- Commerce's export development activities have secured new markets for products and services for more than 1,370 South Carolina companies. South Carolina exports have increased more than 100 percent since 2002;
- PRT joined with the state's electric co-ops to provide all 46 state parks with energy-saving light bulbs and expanded its tourism marketing activities through donated billboard space from the Outdoor Advertisers Association;
- Commerce began the Jobs for America's Graduates program in 2005 based on a national model. This high school dropout prevention program trains high school students for employment within specific industries and has received multiple awards, most recently being named a "Top State Organization for Multi-Year Programs;"
- During our administration, Commerce and PRT have worked to reduce costs and operate more efficiently, resulting in a total cost savings of \$62,928,135.
- Working with federal, state and local agencies, the Department of Revenue created the South Carolina Business One Stop (SCBOS) online registration system. The One Stop served as a simple gateway for business licensing and registration so as to cut out unnecessary layers of

red tape. Since its creation in May 2005, more than 262,000 have registered through the program.

### Capital Investment

South Carolina continues to experience rapid growth in capital investment and new jobs. South Carolina's capital investment has grown from \$1.13 billion in 2003 to \$2.383 billion in 2009, an increase of 110 percent. This means that in 2009 South Carolina had \$526 per capita of capital investment. This is 70 percent higher than North Carolina, \$309 per capita, and 102 percent higher than Georgia, \$259.43 per capita. The Department of Commerce has also recruited more foreign companies from countries such as Germany, France, Switzerland, Canada, and Sweden. In fact, South Carolina is second in the nation in foreign direct investment.

**Capital Investment In South Carolina 2003-2009**



Source: SC Department of Commerce

### Boeing Company


We would be remiss not to comment on the state's monumental achievement in attracting Boeing and its 787 Dreamliner production line to South Carolina. Through the hard work of our administration, led by the Department of Commerce and many state legislators, Boeing announced the largest development project in South Carolina's history – expected to produce a minimum of 3,800 new jobs and invest \$750 million in the North Charleston area. Boeing's investment adds to the already-thriving aeronautics industry in South Carolina, which has about 100 aviation-related companies employing more than 16,000 South Carolinians. With this announcement, South Carolina seems well positioned to maintain our national and international prominence as an ideal place to do business.

## BMW

Governor Campbell deserves enormous credit for helping bring BMW to South Carolina in 1992. In March 2008, however, BMW began a \$750 million expansion of their South Carolina operation. The expansion added 1.5 million square feet to the existing 2.5 million square foot facility. It was the single largest investment BMW has made in the state.

## Employment in South Carolina

With the influx of people coming to South Carolina, our labor force continues to grow and impact our state's unemployment rate, which currently stands at 10.6 percent. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), since 2003 our labor force has grown by more than 267,000 people. Since January 2003, our state ranks seventh in labor force growth (10.49 percent) and 15<sup>th</sup> in employment growth (4.48 percent) among all states. By contrast, Massachusetts ranks 46<sup>th</sup> in labor force growth and 46<sup>th</sup> in employment growth over the same period of time, yet Massachusetts has only an 8.9 percent unemployment rate. As our labor force continues to grow, we must work even harder to spur economic development and job creation in South Carolina.



## Coastal Property Insurance Reform

In 2007, our administration signed the Omnibus Coastal Property Insurance Reform Act. The Act created the South Carolina Safe Home program, which grants help to qualifying coastal homeowners to retrofit their properties and make them less susceptible to damages caused by hurricanes and

severe wind. Since its inception, the South Carolina Safe Home program has received 2,156 grant applications and awarded 1,274 grants totaling approximately \$5.4 million.

### **Improve Soil Conditions for More Job Creation**

The global economy continues to diversify, and emerging markets across the globe are becoming more adept at competing with the United States. South Carolina must focus on recruiting the best of the best – high quality companies committed to growing their business and creating high paying jobs for our citizens.

South Carolina works tirelessly to promote its strengths and existing framework for business while working to minimize or eliminate our weaknesses. Our state's access to markets, transportation and power infrastructure, available sites for development, nationally recognized worker training programs, and strong technical college system are major points of interest for companies seeking to relocate or expand in South Carolina. Fortunately, South Carolina's weaknesses are identifiable and can be solved with the right approach. This administration firmly believes that we should make policy choices based on what we can do to improve our weaknesses – from strengthening our education system to providing a more business-friendly environment for companies of all sizes – while also maintaining our competitive edge in the global marketplace.

On November 2 of this year South Carolina voters approved the Secret Ballot Amendment which the South Carolina Department of Commerce and our administration strongly supported. This constitutional amendment gives individuals the right to vote by secret ballot when deciding on labor union representation which strengthens South Carolinas soil conditions.

Cultivating our economic soil conditions for business will improve South Carolina's ability to compete. A 2008 *Wall Street Journal* article commented that the Competitiveness Index created by the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) identifies "16 policy variables that have a proven impact on the migrations of capital – both investment capital and human capital – in to and out of states." Its analysis shows that "generally speaking, states that spend less, especially on income transfer programs, and states that tax less, particularly on productive activities such as working or investing, experience higher growth rates than states that tax and spend more. The simple answer is that governance, taxes and regulatory policy matter. The playing field among the states was not flat. Business conditions were better in the successful states than in the lagging ones. Capital and labor gravitated to where the burdens were smaller and the opportunities greater." As we have advocated since taking office, reforming the tax structure in South Carolina will significantly increase the numbers of investors coming to South Carolina.

The broad-based changes we have advocated are devoted to equipping South Carolina to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond. These changes include reducing taxes to stimulate the economy, reforming the judicial system to stop frivolous litigation, and helping small businesses provide their employees with health insurance.

While we have made progress, we can always do more. To fully illustrate to the world that South Carolina can and should compete on the global stage, we continue to examine and propose solutions that will ensure our meeting that end.

### ***Broad-Based Incentives***

We have expressed our concerns that our tax code carves out far too many incentives for only one area of the state or for only one business that may come to our state. In 2007, we asked the Department of Commerce to review our incentive system, and it reported that “some of the current incentives contained within the tax code have become obsolete or have been amended to the point that they no longer serve their original purposes.” Accordingly, we believe it is time to stop singling out counties or businesses and take a look at our tax code in a much broader perspective.

#### **1. Film Incentives**

While we support the need for reasonable and effective film incentives, we continue to believe that South Carolina’s current film incentives neither create permanent jobs for South Carolinians nor develop a sustainable, self-sufficient film production industry. Rather, in many cases film producers use the generous wage rebates offered under the current program to provide jobs to out-of-state film crews that only temporarily locate to South Carolina during filming. A study conducted by economist Frank Hefner of the College of Charleston confirms that our film incentives are not producing positive returns for the state. For instance, Hefner's study shows that the state’s general fund loses 81 cents for every dollar the state invests in film incentives. If the film incentive program was achieving its intended goal of creating jobs for South Carolina residents, then more income tax revenue would be coming into the state. However, in its current form, the film incentive program merely subsidizes jobs for non-residents with hard-earned dollars from South Carolina taxpayers.

We are not alone in questioning whether film incentives effectively create jobs and encourage economic development, as several other states are considering eliminating or modifying their film incentives. Missouri has proposed eliminating film incentives entirely, while Gov. Perry of Texas has proposed a cut of \$9 million to the states film and television incentives. A recent study in Michigan showed that film incentives cost taxpayers \$10 in taxes for every \$1 in taxes generated by the film industry.

### ***A Simple, Low, and Flat Taxation Rate***

During the 2005 legislative session, the General Assembly recognized the administration’s long-standing position on the current tax rate for the almost 100,000 South Carolina small businesses, and rightfully sought to decrease the tax burden on small business. Together, we reduced the income tax rate paid by S-corporations, LLCs, and sole proprietors from seven to five percent during a four-year period. When fully implemented, this reduction will put nearly \$124 million each year back into the hands of small-business owners. While this was a great step toward overall tax relief, this administration continues to believe it is time to offer the same tax relief to individual South Carolinians through a simpler and fairer tax code.

Currently, South Carolinians are burdened by the second highest effective income tax rate in the Southeast. As a result, South Carolina is in danger of falling behind in the global competition for jobs and capital investment. Offering an optional flat tax will not only simplify the current tax code, which includes confusing paperwork for exemptions and deductions, but also attract economic and human capital to the state.



A flat tax is a simple reform that will make South Carolina more competitive in the ever-evolving global marketplace, attracting jobs and capital. Currently, 10 states have a flat tax:

State	Flat Tax Rate Percentage
Colorado	4.63
Connecticut	3.0
Illinois	5.0
Indiana	3.4
Massachusetts	5.3
Michigan	4.35
Pennsylvania	3.07
Rhode Island	6.5
Tennessee	6.0
Utah	5.35

We believe it is time South Carolina taxpayers have the choice of a lower, flat income tax rate. When Rhode Island was considering its flat tax, Rhode Island House Speaker William Murphy – a Democrat – said of the flat tax that “the ultimate goal is to put more money directly into people’s pockets both by giving relief to those who need it and by making Rhode Island a more attractive place for business.”

Other countries have also experienced success by implementing a flat tax as a means of improving their economic climate. Currently, more than 20 nations have some form of a flat tax. Lithuania and Estonia adopted a flat tax only a few years after the collapse of the Soviet Union in the mid-1990s. These nations have reported increased tax revenues and a decline in unemployment. Lithuania has experienced some of the fastest growth in Europe since adopting a flat tax. Subsequently, Russia introduced a flat income tax in 2001, and four years after implementation, total real receipts from personal income taxes more than doubled.

Our flat tax plan would put an end to complex tax compliance requirements and tax returns. The flat tax option is simply about giving taxpayers the choice of a simpler, lower, and flatter income tax rate. Our plan specifically calls for a 3.7 percent optional flat income tax rate with no deductions or exemptions – ultimately providing \$95 million in income tax relief. We also recommend full indexation of the individual income tax brackets – giving all income taxpayers relief for a total of \$7.2 million. We propose to offset the income tax revenue decrease with a cigarette tax increase of 30 cents. In 2010, we vetoed a cigarette tax increase that was not revenue-neutral. We believe a recession is the last time we should increase taxes on anyone.

### ***A More Effective Way of Funding Roads***

In January 2007, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) suggested that states consider leasing and selling their roads and infrastructure to private investors. Former USDOT Secretary Mary Peters offered model legislation for states to use to authorize public-private partnerships for “building, owning or operating highways, mass transit, railroads, airports, seaports or other

transportation infrastructure.” Some states, including Virginia, Texas, and Indiana, have already passed legislation along these lines.

From 2007 to 2008 South Carolina saw a sharp increase in the administrative disbursements per mile or responsibility, climbing from \$2,688 per mile in 2007 to \$8,499 in 2008. This is an increase of \$242 million in one year. In 2005, the General Assembly approved a 16 percent increase for SCDOT (\$86 million in recurring dollars). To put SCDOT’s budget into perspective, the agency’s total budget has grown 81 percent since 1995, while the total state budget has grown only 77 percent. We think we should explore additional ways to improve our state’s transportation infrastructure without placing more burden on South Carolina’s taxpayers.

Indiana is an example of a state already advancing this goal. Indiana authorized the 75-year lease of the 157-mile Indiana Toll Road to private investors for \$3.85 billion in up-front cash.

Florida is a terrific example of another alternative to traditional highway funding mechanism. In 2006, a reversible toll road opened in Tampa in an effort to reduce congestion to and from Tampa during rush hour traffic. Ultimately, the reversible toll road – which carries traffic towards Tampa during the morning commute and away from Tampa during the after-work rush hour – reduced the average commute time by one hour and costs each driver only \$3 per day. Additionally, the toll road was constructed as an elevated structure suspended over the existing highway, so the government did not have to acquire additional private land. Today, the toll road carries almost 16,000 vehicles per day to and from Tampa – all without a single tax dollar.

In South Carolina, we believe that the I-73 project presents an opportunity for the state to utilize private investors to assist in moving this project forward. I-73 is a \$2.4 billion project, but so far only \$103 million has been allocated. At the rate money is being secured for this project, I-73 will not be built for decades. We believe that South Carolina should look for private investors who can finance this project and bring it to fruition in a timely manner.

Ultimately, finding alternative funding mechanisms for building and improving our roads and infrastructure would not only provide different means to fund repairs and improvements, but it would also have the potential to create new jobs and perhaps billions of dollars in investment in South Carolina.

### ***Workers’ Compensation***

Businesses had been faced with alarming increases in premiums tied to compensating employees who are injured on the job. This problem was never more evident than when the National Council on Compensation Insurance proposed a 33 percent overall rate increase in 2005.

Four years ago, this administration signed into law comprehensive workers’ compensation reform designed to enhance South Carolina’s business climate. The law’s goal is to stop increasing workers’ compensation insurance costs and inject much-needed consistency into our state’s workers’ compensation system.

Key provisions of our reform law included abolishing the Second Injury Fund, strengthening the qualification requirements for people that testify as medical experts, and reversing a court decision

that prohibited the employee's physician or health care provider from contacting the employer about the employee's injury.


Despite our progress, the Legislature has yet to adopt objective standards for workers' compensation awards. We fell short of truly comprehensive reform by not introducing a strict American Medical Association (AMA) provision – a requirement that commissioners must use objective standards in making disability award determinations. The current method of awarding compensation has proven to be unfair to the South Carolina business community, as the workers' compensation awards are currently 181 percent of the medical guidelines that are used by other states.

Nonetheless, we are encouraged that reforms have had a positive impact on the workers' compensation system. For example, in November 2008, the National Council on Compensation Insurance recommended a decrease in premiums – for the first time in seven years. Also, in 2007 the Workers' Compensation Commission adopted a new form for claimants not represented by an attorney, requiring physicians to use the American Medical Association guidelines in determining medical impairment. In addition to these cost-saving changes, we believe there are additional areas for improvement within our workers' compensation system.

### ***Tourism***

The Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism (PRT) excels at promoting South Carolina, while also providing jobs and opportunities for our workforce. Our state's \$18.4 billion tourism industry attracts tourists, and economy-boosting revenue, from all over the country.

Each year, more than 30 million people take trips in South Carolina, and tourism represents 6.0 percent of our total Gross State Product. When deciding how best to allocate our tourism and marketing dollars, we must focus on activities that provide the greatest benefit to South Carolina's economy. Further development of effective marketing techniques is critical to attracting out-of-state visitors; in fact, PRT gets a 32:1 return on investment for the state tourism marketing plan. From 2003 to 2009, domestic travel expenditures in South Carolina grew by a total of 36.8 percent.



### **Conclusion**

Moving the state's economy forward by improving our state's underlying soil conditions for business is a significant priority for this administration. Maintaining a robust small business community, eliminating regulatory barriers for companies, and continuing to emphasize limited government spending and a low tax burden on our citizens will all provide South Carolina with greater opportunities for job creation and economic growth.

# Meet the Health Care Challenge

## Meet the Health Care Challenge

**Bureaucrats now have the power to force private health plans to make business decisions based on regulations rather than on what is best for company or customer health. This kind of governmental micromanaging of health care – seen nowhere else in our business sector – is anathema to the free market. More importantly, it endangers the lives and well-being of millions of Americans.**

- **David Merritt and Former U.S. Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, *The Wall Street Journal*, July 30, 2010, “Who Decides on Health-Care Value?”**

After much debate, in March 2010, President Barack Obama signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), which requires most Americans to have health insurance. By doing so, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the law adds 16 million people to the Medicaid rolls and subsidizes private coverage for low- and middle-income people, at a cost to federal taxpayers of \$938 billion over 10 years.

During the debate, our administration was vocal in our opposing the bill and encouraging South Carolinians – who will bear the bill’s substantial costs – to make their voices heard by contacting federal representatives. Today, we continue to believe the health care bill was a trillion-dollar mistake, both financially and medically. This unprecedented move takes us another step away from the free market and toward increased state control of health care. In fact, we describe this measure as an “unwanted, unwise, and unwelcome health care bill.”

For South Carolina, the bill expands our state’s Medicaid rolls by nearly half a million people (one-third of our population) and costs the state budget, at minimum, an additional \$917 million over the next decade. In fact, recent analysis estimates that PPACA will cost the state budget, from fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2024, \$4.8 billion. For small businesses, it increases health care costs and incentivizes employers to hire fewer people. In fact, the law nearly triples the penalty for businesses that fail to provide health insurance – even if the failure is because the businesses simply cannot afford the coverage – and also includes an unprecedented extension of the Medicare tax. All told, the law has an overall tax increase of roughly \$570 billion. Given the dire budget situation that the state is currently facing, this law forces state legislators to either make even more significant cuts to education, law enforcement, and economic development, or to raise taxes.

Our administration continues to support market-based health care options that will improve the quality of life for our citizens and slow the growth of health care spending. Ultimately, we believe the key to managing Medicaid-related health care costs and enhancing the quality of care is to give recipients the tools and opportunities to become smarter health care consumers, as well as fostering competition within the system.

### **Where We Are Succeeding**

During our administration, we have had four major accomplishments regarding the state health plan that not only saves money, but also offers incentives to participants and encourages healthy behavior.

#### **State Health Plan**

First, as part of an effort to combat the rising costs of health care, in 2005, South Carolina became the second state in the nation to offer Health Savings Accounts (HSAs) to state employees. An HSA is a tax-free account that can be used to pay health care expenses. This plan enables subscribers to take greater responsibility for their medical care by offering the opportunity to reduce their insurance premiums and set aside money for qualified medical expenses.

An important advantage of an HSA is that it is owned by the employee. Additionally, funds do not have to be spent in the plan year they are deposited. Money in the account, including interest, accumulates tax-free, so the funds can be used to pay qualified medical expenses in the future. If an employee is no longer employed by the state, he can take the account and continue to use it for qualified medical expenses. Currently, almost 1,500 state employees contribute to an HSA.

Second, recognizing that non-tobacco users should not have to pay for the poor health choices of their coworkers, our administration pushed for an initiative to give state workers a discount if they do not use tobacco products. In August 2008, the Budget and Control Board approved a \$25 monthly discount for employees who do not use tobacco products. The Budget and Control Board passed the measure, in part, to compensate for the approximately \$76 million per year that the state health insurance plan spends on tobacco-related illnesses. A year later, the Board approved increasing this discount to \$40 single/\$60 family to offset the estimated \$172/month in tobacco-related costs to the State Health Plan. The discount started in January 2010 and with almost 427,000 participants, including employees and their family members, estimates show that around 85 percent of state workers will receive a discount. Individuals should have the right to use tobacco, but they should not expect others to pay for their poor health decisions.

Third, since almost 100,000 state health plan participants suffer from a chronic disease such as diabetes or cardiovascular disease (or both), we continue to believe that encouraging participation in a state employee wellness plan will help combat chronic disease and save money. In December 2009, the Budget and Control Board approved the State Employee Wellness Initiative. This plan addresses health concerns in a positive way. Interested state employees must complete four steps to include completion of a health survey, doctor's visit, specific lab tests, and phone contact with a health coach to qualify for the 12-month copayment waiver. The Employee Insurance Program estimates, the state health plan will save more than \$5.3 million a year with 25 percent participation.

Fourth, in July 2007, the Government Efficiency and Accountability Review (GEAR) Committee recommended changes to the state health plan's unlimited chiropractic benefit. In 2008, the state health plan spent more than \$25 million for this benefit. To combat excessive spending, in August 2009, the Budget and Control Board adopted a \$2,000 chiropractic limit per covered person per year. The state health plan expects to save \$6.98 million per year by capping services in the standard plan.

For us to have a clear understanding of where we are headed as a state, we must have an equally clear understanding of where we have been during the past several years. During our administration, our state has made significant headway in addressing the following health care costs and related concerns:

**Medicaid**

- Launching of “Healthy Connections Choices” gives Medicaid beneficiaries the option to choose among several market-based health plans that encourage healthy behaviors. The extra services, coordinated care, and improved quality offered through the health plans will lead to better outcomes for the South Carolina Medicaid population. In fiscal year 2009, Healthy Connections Choices saved about \$12 million in state funds.
- “Healthy Connections Choices” keeps Medicaid growth rate to less than the national average. In 2009, the National Medicaid enrollment growth was 7.5 percent. Meanwhile, South Carolina's enrollment growth during this period was lower than the national average – at 5.1 percent. In June 2010, enrollment growth in our state increased to 6 percent.
- Implementing a preferred drug list in 2004 to save on Medicaid prescription costs and Medicaid fee-for-service co-payments. To date, these savings total \$165 million.
- Reducing fraud and abuse in the Medicaid system. In fiscal year 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services recovered more than \$41 million in state funds from providers and beneficiaries through reviews for waste, fraud, and abuse. This was a 46 percent increase from the previous year in overall recoveries by conducting audits, taking tips via a toll-free number and utilizing data mining technology to reveal billing irregularities.
- Preparing for the transition to electronic health records for the medical community, as called for in the federal HITECH Act. The state Medicaid agency has been a leading partner in educating and empowering health care providers so they can adopt health IT.
- Supporting a life-saving organ donor registry which conserves an estimated \$24 million Medicaid dollars.

**Social Services**

- Leading the fight, starting in 2004, to restore adoption incentives from \$250 to \$1,500 has directly impacted the number of finalized adoptions by DSS. During the time when this funding was reduced to \$250 from \$1500, many foster parents were unable to complete the planned adoptions of their foster children (60 percent of children adopted from foster care are adopted by their foster parents) due to the high cost of legal fees. Ultimately, this meant foster care children remained in care for a longer period of time – even though there was a family waiting to adopt. Since funding was restored, finalized adoptions increased by 62 percent (329 to 532).



- Decreasing the time it takes to finalize adoptions. Currently, it takes 39 months to finalize the average child adoption process. This is a six month decrease since FY 2005-06 when it was 45.2 months. Additionally, 20.3 percent of foster children were adopted within 24 months. While this remains below the 32 percent national standard, significant progress has been made.
- Creating the Children in Foster Care and Adoption Services Task Force in 2007. The recommendations that have been implemented include creating a registry for birth fathers to help expedite the termination of parental rights process, streamlining the process for serving notice in adoption hearings; accelerating hearings for termination of parental rights; and more aggressively recruiting foster and adoptive parents.
- Changing the delivery system for the Family Independence job assistance program, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP-formerly known as “food stamps”), and Child Care services, from paper-driven systems to automated imaged systems. This allows citizens to interact with the agency electronically or through a call center. This automation, which saved \$2 million in storage costs, enables workers to deliver services more efficiently. This type of change is extremely important when the number of recipients served has increased to an historical high of more than one million citizens.
- Partnering with the Office of Rural Health and the South Carolina BlueCross BlueShield Foundation to bring the “Benefit Bank” to SC. This allows residents to have access to much needed work supports and tax credits. The Benefit Bank uses DSS’s online application for SNAP and Family Independence benefits. Since October 2010, more than 18,000 online applications have been received – more than 120 per day, including weekends and holidays.
- Reorganizing the Department of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Services (DAODAS) and allowing the resulting cost savings to be directed to the field for direct services to help prevent or reduce the negative consequences of substance use and addictions.
- Preventing teens from gaining access to tobacco products to decrease health care costs. In 1995, children 12 to 17 years old were successful in purchasing tobacco from retail outlets almost 55 percent of the time. More than 15 years later, the purchase rate has decreased to 7.9 percent. This has been accomplished with a combination of intensive collaboration with law enforcement partners in terms of enforcement and providing education and training to tobacco vendors at the point of sale.
- Working with the March of Dimes and state’s private physician practices and faith-based organizations, DHEC continues to make certain pregnant women have access to needed services. By doing so, the infant mortality rate (2008) is at its lowest in 20 years. In addition, DHEC reports South Carolina’s 2008 infant mortality rate of 8.0 deaths for each 1,000 live births has declined from the 2007 rate of 8.5.



## Mental Health

- Enhancing core services that support the recovery of people with mental illnesses. The “Toward Local Care” (TLC) program at the Department of Mental Health (DMH) provides high quality community based services that save \$34 million dollars annually. The TLC program, which began in 1991, returns long-term psychiatric inpatient clients to live in the community through intensive support from Community Mental Health Centers. Clients with a significant history of short-term hospitalizations or frequent emergency room visits are also sometimes allowed to participate. The statistics below show TLC is an effective program:
  - In 2008, DMH compared the cost of providing services in a TLC funded program to the cost of inpatient hospitalization. The inpatient cost was \$84,427 per year as opposed to \$36,373 for TLC – a savings of \$48,054 per year/per patient.
  - To date, 2,516 clients with serious and persistent mental illness (1,882 from a long-term, institutional setting) have participated in the program. At the end of fiscal year 2010, more than 1,000 patients were receiving TLC services across the state.
  - Having moved almost 1,900 long-term patients from institutional level of care resulted in the ability of DMH to save money by closing the Crafts-Farrow and State Hospital campuses for civilly committed adult patients.
- Developing, through DMH and the Veterans Administration, a statewide referral system to provide timely information and assistance to soldiers and their families by participating in “The Returning Veterans and Their Families Strategic Planning Conference and Policy Academy.” Options include creating, through the private sector, recreation and athletic programs for soldiers, veterans, and their families and exploring ways to provide mental health services in rural areas.
- Pioneering the development of the nation's first statewide telepsychiatry project helps to solve the difficulty in placing mental health patients waiting in emergency rooms. With a total grant amount received over the last three years of \$5.2 million from The Duke Endowment, South Carolina's DMH is the first to use this type of telemedicine statewide. Currently 17 hospitals are directly linked to DMH where psychiatrists are available statewide, and have conducted 3,587 “face-to-face” consultations as of September 2010.

This past year we have had additional accomplishments that will positively affect the health of our citizens, which in turn will help save taxpayers money. Accomplishments we are highlighting relate to the areas of health insurance, prevention, mental health, early detection and treatment, rehabilitation, nutrition, and fraud and abuse prevention.

### ***Health Insurance Options***

The majority of working South Carolinians (8 in 10 workers) is employed by a small business. However, many small business owners cannot afford to offer health insurance coverage to their employees. To combat this, in 2008, we signed the Small Business Health Care Act which allows small employers to form health cooperatives. These cooperatives allow small businesses to band together to get lower health insurance rates, as rates are mostly determined by the size of a group. By joining together, the small businesses form one large insurance pool that benefits from that strength in numbers. Today, the state's first health insurance cooperative is accepting applications for membership. The private, nonprofit organization known as the South Carolina Health Cooperative, is not only the first health insurance cooperative in the state, but it is also one of just a few nationwide.

Medicaid is no longer a one-size-fits-all program. As we previously stated, by implementing "South Carolina Healthy Connections," we give individuals a choice in their health care plans and empower them to pick the plan that best suits their needs. Along with the traditional fee-for-service plan, beneficiaries have six available options which include:

- Five market-driven health plans that compete to serve Medicaid beneficiaries, which may provide extra benefits beyond traditional Medicaid. A key component of this reform is connecting beneficiaries to one primary care physician, or "medical home," to better coordinate and improve care.
- Individualized services that encourage responsible use of Medicaid health dollars through a pilot program to study the benefits of offering HSA-style accounts to Medicaid beneficiaries. These accounts, called Health Opportunity Accounts (HOAs), are the first of their kind in the country. HOAs encourage prudent use of health care services and support a beneficiary's transition off Medicaid since a portion of any unused HOA funds can be used by the individual for health care, education, or job-training needs.

In addition to these current coordinated care options, South Carolina will be expanding options by adding two more medical home networks in early 2011.

### ***Prevention and Screenings***

The importance of prevention as well as screenings cannot be stressed enough. The Hollings Cancer Center at the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) and the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) continue to promote healthier behaviors and prevention programs. With these public and private efforts, the number of South Carolinians undergoing health screenings is increasing. We have succeeded on many levels during the past year:

- The Hollings Cancer Center's Mobile Health Unit traveled throughout 11 Lowcountry counties, providing almost 3,000 screenings to treat those living in medically underserved areas. In addition, the center continues to expand partnerships with employers and school districts.

- DHEC continues to work with many partners by developing agreements with the 20 Federally Qualified Primary Care Centers to give free vaccines for underinsured children and youth. In February 2009, DHEC developed an agreement with the National Association of School Nurses to partner in the development of web-based educational modules on diabetes care in the schools for school nurses.
- The number of women screened for breast and cervical screenings, cardiovascular risk assessment, and follow-up increased from 9,000 to 16,000. Funds were also received to support colonoscopy screenings for the uninsured.

### ***Mental Health***

As is true nationally, people with mental illnesses and substance abuse disorders continue to wait long hours in emergency rooms for treatment. DMH reports that the number of persons waiting statewide in emergency rooms for mental health or substance abuse treatment has declined almost 10 percent when compared to the same timeframe last year (July 1 to September 30). DMH and DAODAS took the following steps:

- Sharing funding with and providing crisis intervention services at all 17 local mental health centers to those with co-occurring substance abuse and mental health disorders – both geared to prevent unnecessary emergency room admissions and assure more appropriate treatment needs are met. DMH has dedicated more than \$4.5 million to alleviate this crisis.
- Contracting with private psychiatric or detoxification inpatient facilities to expedite movement from an ER setting to a more clinically appropriate one. By doing so, patients are less likely to return to the ER for mental health or substance abuse treatment – especially if followed intensively as an outpatient once discharged from those private settings. In fact, for several years, the majority of those seeking emergency services are patients without a recent history of treatment. Almost 75 percent of patients have had no contact with DMH for at least three years prior to an ER visit.

We also want to highlight the sale of the historic old State Hospital in Columbia – one of the most anticipated and significant land deals in city history. Over the years, legal snags have slowed the sale that has been envisioned for more than a decade. In 2003, our administration pushed for the 178-acre Bull Street campus – used to treat the mentally ill since the 1700s – to be sold. Seven years later, an Upstate developer reentered negotiations with the South Carolina Department of Mental Health to purchase Columbia's largest in-town tract open for development. However, before the final agreement can take effect, DMH must formally present it to a Court (since the parcel is owned by a trust dedicated to the treatment of the mentally ill) and to the Budget and Control Board for approval.

### ***Detection and Treatment***

The state recognizes the positive impact that early detection and proper treatment of diseases have on the quality of life of South Carolina communities. Whether it relates to cancer, substance abuse, or the treatment of disabilities, the state has seen success in many areas.

- The Hollings Cancer Center holds the prestigious National Cancer Institute (NCI) designation. Hollings is the only cancer center in South Carolina – and just one of 65 centers in the nation – to hold NCI designation. This distinction is awarded only to cancer centers doing cutting-edge research.
- In July 2010, the Hollings Cancer Center also was named a Breast Imaging Center of Excellence by the American College of Radiology. This designation is awarded to centers that undergo a rigorous and voluntary review. It reflects a center's commitment to cutting-edge imaging technology and a highly-trained staff.
- MUSC continues to participate in many clinical research trials. For example, MUSC is leading a national, multi-center clinical trial studying the effects of combining powerful drugs in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinomas, or cancer originating in the liver.
- By continuing to offer a wide array of treatment services through its statewide network of nationally-accredited county alcohol and drug abuse authorities, DAODAS is making great strides. Tailor-made programs (i.e., day treatment, detoxification services, and intensive family services) meet the unique needs of each individual. This past year, DAODAS reports marked improvement for their clients as more than 70.3 percent report no alcohol use following discharge from services (36 percent increase from admission to discharge from services ) and more than 70.26 percent report being employed following discharge from services (1.5 percent increase from admission to discharge from services).
- To keep families together using the most cost-effective service approach for taxpayers, South Carolina continues to do a great job of supporting caregivers. This past year, the Department of Disabilities and Special Needs (DDSN) served more than 84 percent of the 30,900 consumers in their homes. Of the individuals served who have mental retardation or autism, 74 percent live with family compared to only 57 percent nationally.

### ***Rehabilitation***

By enabling eligible South Carolinians with disabilities to prepare for, achieve, and maintain competitive employment, the state encourages these citizens to become taxpayers instead of tax consumers. Estimates for 2009 indicate rehabilitated clients will pay back \$3.33 for every vocational rehabilitation dollar spent. That results in the client repaying the cost of rehabilitation within 5.5 years, which is an 18 percent annual rate of return. In addition, we would like to recognize:

- Walgreens, with support from South Carolina Department of Disabilities and Special Needs (DDSN) and the South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department (SCVRD), has hired more than 200 workers with disabilities (40 percent of the facility's workforce). Walgreens, the nation's largest drugstore chain, became a showcase for the employment of people with disabilities when it opened last year its new distribution center in Anderson, SC. Their goal is to have 1,000 employees with various disabilities employed with starting salaries comparable to non-disabled coworkers.
- In 2010, SCVRD rehabilitated 7,671 people with disabilities into employment. Since 2005, the department has had the nation's second highest rate of persons rehabilitated (181 for Federal fiscal year 2009). In addition, compared to other states, the SCVRD has the third lowest cost per rehabilitation among Vocational Rehabilitation agencies.

### ***Nutrition***

Unhealthy eating and inactivity contribute to between 300,000 to 600,000 deaths each year, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services – that's 13 times more people than killed by guns and 20 times more people than are killed by drug use. To motivate our citizens, there are several programs aimed at creating greater access to proper food and nutrition.

- The Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program provides low-income seniors with coupons that can be exchanged for eligible foods at farmers markets and roadside stands. The program operates in 36 counties and provides benefits to approximately 26,180 low-income seniors.
- The "Elderly Simplified Application Project" (ESAP) simplifies the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (formerly Food Stamp) application process for low-income elderly. Since the inception of the federally approved project, the number of cases in South Carolina more than doubled in five years from 11,134 (Sept. 2005) to 29,769 (August 2010).

We also want to help the three out of every five South Carolina adults who are overweight and the one out of three students who are overweight. To do so, we support the South Carolina Eat Smart, Move More Partnership which is working to create and promote communities that support healthy eating and active living. This partnership is an ongoing collaboration between state agencies, business and industry, health care organizations, schools, and community members.

### ***AIDS Drugs and HIV Testing***

While investment in treatment and research is helping people with HIV/AIDS live longer and more productive lives, the disease continues to spread at a staggering national rate of more than 56,000 new infections a year. In 2008, South Carolina ranked 10th highest in the nation for AIDS case rates. There were approximately 779 South Carolinians diagnosed with HIV/AIDS in 2009, bringing the total number of citizens living with HIV/AIDS to more than 14,000. The actual

number living with HIV/AIDS in the state is unknown because many are unaware of their infection status.

DHEC's prevention efforts help to identify people with HIV who do not know their HIV status and then link them into treatment services. Efforts in 2009 included:

- Providing HIV conventional testing in DHEC clinics to almost 45,000 people, as well as supporting HIV rapid testing to almost 6,000 people in community-based settings.
- Expanding HIV testing to reach more African-Americans. (Among reported cases, 69 percent of men living with HIV/AIDS and 82 percent of women living with HIV/AIDS in South Carolina are African-American.) A three-year grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention allows DHEC to create new partnerships with hospitals to initiate routine HIV testing in counties with the highest infection rates.

### ***Fraud and Abuse Efforts***

As stated earlier, in fiscal year 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services recovered more than \$41 million in state funds from providers and beneficiaries through reviews for waste, fraud, and abuse. This was part of a 46 percent increase from the previous year in overall recoveries. Astonishingly, since 2006, the agency has increased its amount recovered by 307 percent. In addition, since 2006 the number of waste, fraud and abuse cases increased from 254 (fiscal year 2006) to 865 (fiscal year 2010) – a 240 percent increase.

State Fiscal Year	Cases Opened	Amount Recovered in Millions
2006	254	\$10.1
2007	404	\$11.8
2008	366	\$19.0
2009	580	\$22.0
2010	865	\$41.1

Specifically, through its Program Integrity division, DHHS has aggressively pursued Medicaid fraud and abuse and dramatically increased collections. The agency has instituted a pharmacy “lock-in” program for beneficiaries who show patterns of prescription drug-seeking and abuse. Prescription drug abusers sometimes referred to as “high flyers,” often attempt to utilize multiple pharmacies and doctors to mask their habit. The program ensures the individuals must get all prescriptions from one pharmacy. About 200 beneficiaries have been identified through a data analysis that flagged unusual claims activity. Data analysis of the initial results shows an average savings per beneficiary of \$5,600 through fewer filled prescriptions and hospital visits.

### **Opportunities for Improvement**

While these successes are steps in the right direction, many challenges remain. In this executive budget we call for improvements in the state’s adoption and foster care services, continue to encourage state employees to stop smoking, support offering consumer friendly health plans that are “mandate free,” encourage more government transparency and, once again, request that the General Assembly reorganize our government in a manner that better serves our citizens. We can and must do better.



Everybody knows that cigarettes are detrimental to one's health, but most smokers can't see past the cost of their next pack to the price they will ultimately pay for lighting up – both physically and financially. Smoking may be an individual choice, but its burden is carried by everyone in this country. The cost of care required to treat diseases caused by smoking are paid for by every American through higher insurance premiums, government programs, and taxes – all of which can decrease our quality of life.

- Rep. Phil Gingrey, R-GA, “Smoking can cost you more than your health,” *The Hill* (September 10, 2010)

### ***Smoking Cessation and Non-Smoker Discount***

With more than 60,000 employees, state government is the largest employer in the state. We believe it ought to use the same best practices being used by other employers to improve the productivity and quality of life of their workers. For example, many private programs offer smoking cessation programs with premium incentives because it makes good business sense. It is no secret that healthier workers are more productive workers.

With our support, the Budget and Control Board has included smoking cessation as part of the State Employee Insurance Plan since 2006. Interest continues to grow, and the results are encouraging. In 2006, more than 2,100 Plan participants were enrolled in the “Quit for Life” program. Since that time, it has more than doubled to include almost 5,000 participants and has a 45 percent quit rate. Our hope is that more state employees will take advantage of this opportunity to beat their nicotine addiction.

As stated earlier, we believe state employees who do not use tobacco should not have to pay for the poor health choices of their coworkers – especially since the state health plan spends \$76 million per year on tobacco-related illnesses. Our administration pushed for the initiative to give state workers a discount if they do not use tobacco products. The discount began in January 2010 and with almost 427,000 participants, including employees and their family members, estimates show that around 85 percent of state workers will receive a discount. Individuals should have the right to use tobacco, but they should not expect others to pay for their poor health decisions.

### ***Adoption and Foster Care***

We have long believed that one of the state's primary roles is to protect and provide for vulnerable children. With that in mind, this administration has consistently called for improvements in the state's adoption and foster care services. Over the past 10 years, more than 4,300 children have been adopted through the South Carolina Department of Social Services. During FY 2009-10 the Department finalized 532 adoptions, the most in its history. During the last three years, DSS averaged 524 adoptions. Still, more than 1,600 children still seek an adoptive home in our state.

We hope to see the General Assembly evaluate the remaining Children in Foster Care and Adoption Services Task Force recommendations, including hiring more DSS and court personnel dedicated to

reducing the termination of parental rights caseload. We believe this will start us on the path toward more efficiency and reduced wait times for adoption, resulting in an improved quality of life for hundreds of children and parents across South Carolina.

### ***Supporting Consumer Choice***

The South Carolina Department of Insurance reports 29 different mandates cost families almost \$550 a year. Mandates not only increase the cost of health insurance premiums to the individual and overall costs to employers, they also affect the marketplace. Although larger insurance companies can absorb these costs because of their volumes, smaller companies find them harder to absorb. This allows bigger providers to grab ever larger portions of the health care marketplace. Less competition ultimately leads to higher health insurance pricing for all families in this state.

During our administration, to alleviate the costly mandate burden, we have proposed a “consumer choice” individual policy that could be made available for \$150 per month for those who only want coverage for large catastrophic expenses. This is less than half of the \$421 (single coverage/ all plan types) that the Kaiser Family Foundation states is the 2010 average monthly premium cost. Many of the uninsured are healthy young adults who could benefit from this type of coverage who may not want or need to pay for mandated coverage items (i.e., maternity benefits).

Unfortunately, consumer friendly options like this one can no longer be considered. Since the passage of President Obama’s Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the new law requires all health plans to provide coverage of preventive services – not just large catastrophic expenses. Thus, small businesses continue to be saddled with numerous mandates that, while well-intentioned, makes the health care they offer less affordable and prevents options like this one from entering the marketplace.

### ***Transparency***

To give the public an overview of how tax dollars are spent in support of Medicaid, our administration continues to support initiatives that increase transparency in government.

Beginning in 2008, DHHS has made detailed spending activity available online. The first phase of the initiative was to post administrative expenditures on the agency Web site. This searchable database lists all travel expenditures, expenditures for office supplies more than \$100, and contractual expenses more than \$100.

To expand upon government transparency, DHHS also launched the Medicaid Provider Transparency Tool, which is a searchable database compiled from more than 25 million claims paid to health care providers throughout the state each year. The site can be searched by name, provider type (physicians, dentists, nursing homes, hospitals, etc.), or by provider location. The Provider Transparency Tool lists the dollar amount individual providers received, the number of patients served, and the average paid per visit. Hospital data also includes Disproportionate Share payments. All enrolled Medicaid providers are included by name, unless they serve so few Medicaid patients that the inclusion of data could be used to identify individual patients. The site has proven to be popular, as it has been visited more than 33,000 times.



Since the vast majority of Medicaid's expenditures are claims, our administration strongly believes allowing the public the opportunity to see where the money is being spent is important. We share these ideas to encourage all state agencies to increase, via the Internet, this type of government transparency.

***Health and Human Services Agency Restructuring***

The Legislative Audit Council recommended in 2003, and we continue to agree, that the General Assembly consolidate the state's health and human service programs. This would eliminate duplication, allow more comprehensive planning and budgeting, and reduce administrative costs. Since then none of the LAC's restructuring recommendations had been implemented.

As we have said in the past, our largest obstacle to improving health care in South Carolina continues to be the fractured health care system we have within state government. Currently, we have separate government agencies answering to four different authorities, providing health services. Many programs and services in these agencies overlap in functions and lack coordination. In addition, the administrative burden of operating those agencies takes dollars away from the frontline services of providing expedient and adequate care and protection to the patient.

Our health care restructuring proposal is focused on reducing these overlapping functions into fewer health care agencies. We propose the merger of these health and human services agencies into one accountable and affordable delivery system under a cabinet-level director to improve accountability, care, and responsiveness to our citizens.

We continue to believe a much larger health care restructuring bill is key to improving service delivery and accountability within this area of state government, and this administration strongly supports the restructuring efforts supported by several legislative members during the last few years. We look forward to the House and Senate moving a meaningful restructuring bill across the finish line. Our Health Care Restructuring Plan is discussed in greater detail in the Modernize Government section of this executive budget.

# Improve K-12 Student Performance

## Improve K-12 Student Performance

Providing for public education is one of the most important functions of any state government. The quality of a state's educational system will partly determine a state's level of economic development, health care, public safety, and overall quality of life. With increasing economic globalization, South Carolina's students are now – more than ever – competing with students from Baltimore to Brazil to Bangladesh.

We must ensure that our students are adequately prepared to compete in the global economy, especially when our state and nation face unprecedented economic difficulties. During lean budget years, we believe it is important to continue to put the maximum amount of resources into the classroom – not on administrative programs. It is critical that we eliminate duplicative, non-performing programs and instead use our money to raise scores on state and national assessments, close the achievement gap between racial and socioeconomic groups, and produce more graduates ready for college or the workforce.

In the past, State Education Superintendent Jim Rex and the Education Oversight Committee recommended that the state freeze teacher salaries (FY 2010-11 school year). This administration has found other ways to keep budget cuts from affecting teacher pay – such as eliminating administrative overhead at the Department of Education – but significant budget reductions have prompted us to recommend a similar salary freeze until our economic environment improves.

Operating our education system on limited resources does not mean that educational quality should suffer. Rather, it presents an opportunity to find creative ways to teach our students. Every child is unique, and we believe that parents can best determine what most benefits their children. Ultimately, we want to restore parental control over education by introducing market-based principles of educational choice, improving public school performance, and expanding educational opportunities for low and middle-income families.

### Developing Our Purchasing Priorities

Our goal since the beginning of this administration has been to see every child excel academically from the first day in kindergarten to the day of high school graduation. To that end, we examined the major indicators of success to determine whether our state is reaching its goal. We have found

#### Administration's Goals for Improving K-12 Student Performance:

- ✓ Increase high school completion rate.
- ✓ Increase student participation, completion, and achievement in rigorous college-preparation courses.
- ✓ Raise the national performance ranking of South Carolina's students on the SAT, ACT, and NAEP.
- ✓ Eliminate the academic achievement gap.
- ✓ Improve efficiency with which education dollars are spent.

that South Carolina is making some progress, but the many opportunities for improvement have determined this year's purchasing priorities.

### ***Where We Are Succeeding***

We have made some progress in K-12 education, especially during this past school year. The new Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) test gives teachers more detailed information on students' academic progress earlier in the school year – allowing teachers to tailor their lesson plans to students' needs. The 2010 PASS Test scores show that our students are making significant improvements in reading and math compared to the first year's test results. We expect that the State Department of Education will work to improve these scores even more.

On the End-of-Course tests – which are required for high school students – more students earned passing grades in Algebra 1, English 1, U.S. History and the Constitution and Physical Science during the 2009-2010 school year than the previous year.

On a national level, we are delighted that 22 of our schools earned recognition through *U.S. News and World Report* rankings as “America's Best High Schools 2010.” The news magazine ranks high schools across the nation each year based on the school's efforts to prepare students for college. Specifically, Charleston County's Academic Magnet High was ranked 12<sup>th</sup> among the nation's top 100 “gold” schools, which is a jump from the school's ranking of 27<sup>th</sup> in 2007.

Additionally, Pickens High School in the Pickens County School District earned national recognition for dropout prevention efforts in 2008. The school earned the National Dropout Prevention Center's Crystal Star Program Award of Excellence in Dropout Recovery, Intervention and Prevention for its model program called “Star Academy.” The academy opened in 2005 as a public-private partnership, which takes students at-risk for dropping out through a rigorous course that allows them to complete their eighth and ninth grades in one school year. During its four years of operation, the Pickens Star Academy has progressively improved its success rate, advancing 73, 76 and 90 percent of over-aged eighth and ninth-graders to the 10th grade in just one year. The program has expanded to a total of 14 Star Academies in 12 South Carolina districts.

Jobs for South Carolina's Graduates is another successful dropout prevention model. Our office has supported JAG-SC – which was adopted from the national model called “Jobs for America's Graduates” – since its inception in 2005. Begun under the State Workforce Investment Board at the state Department of Commerce, JAG-SC uses a vocational skills curriculum, and local businesses partner with participating high schools to offer job training, mentoring, or internships to at-risk students. JAG was piloted in 14 schools, and 95 percent of students returned to school after participating in the program. Suspensions and absenteeism decreased, while academic scores increased. As of the 2009-10 school year, the JAG program existed in 20 schools in South Carolina. Currently, more than 800 students are in the JAG program, and the program boasts a 93.25 percent graduation rate – well above the national JAG standard.

Lastly, we'd like to highlight the success of the South Carolina Virtual School Program (SCVSP). The SCVSP challenges students through rigorous online courses to help increase the ontime graduation rate throughout our state. They also collaborate with the Office of Adult Education to provide online courses for adult students trying to earn a high school diploma. Ranked second in the

nation for online guidelines, policies, and assessability by the Center for Digital Learning, the SCVSP continues to excel in online education. Since its inception in 2007, SCVSP has grown at an average rate of 55 percent. From 2008-09 to 2009-10, the program has experienced 26.4 percent growth. The following table shows the number of South Carolina students who have been served by this program:

School Year	Number of Students
2006-07	1,116
2007-08	6,159
2008-09	11,232
2009-10	14,199

This rate of growth places the SCVSP in the 80th percentile among online learning programs nationally (iNACOL, 2009). Anecdotally, a significant growth area nationally has been K-20 ventures. This involves the ability of high school students to take college level courses, in this case in an online environment. According to data from Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), the majority of virtual schools and programs in the Southeast have seen enrollments increase or decrease in relation to their funding. An exception to this is the SCVSP, which to this point has seen a seven fold increase in service with no increase in funding.

### ***Opportunities for Improvement***


Although we have made some progress in educational performance due to the outstanding efforts of teachers, students, and parents, we cannot ignore the statistics that indicate we have much farther to go to close the gap that exists between South Carolina and the rest of the nation. To help every child succeed academically, we have established five goals – the first and most important is to increase the number of students that graduate from high school.

#### **1. Increase the high school completion rate.**

Research reports uniformly indicate that South Carolina’s high school completion rate is entirely too low. It is unreasonable to expect our state to move in a positive direction when only 60 percent of South Carolina’s students graduate high school in four years. Our goal is to increase significantly the percentage of entering high school freshmen who complete the 24 credits required for high school graduation in eight semesters or less.

According to the 2009 version of Diplomas Count, a study performed for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 66.3 percent of South Carolina’s students enrolled in 9th grade in 2005-06 graduated high school four years later – putting us 37th nationally. The same study found that approximately 1-in-3 students – or 122 pupils each day – dropped out, were held back, or failed to complete the full diploma requirements. Additionally, the National Governor’s Association published a study in 2009 that revealed that 98 high schools in South Carolina graduated less than 60 percent of students within four years.

**School Year 2008-2009 National High School Completion Rate**



In this year's executive budget, we outline several major goals and invest in activities that increase the likelihood that students will be prepared to enter and complete high school within four years.

**2. Increase student participation, completion, and achievement in rigorous college-preparation courses.**

South Carolina's position in the global economy can largely be determined by the quality of the education we provide for our students. As we focus on getting more students to finish school on time, we must also monitor the quality of their education. We must strive not only to get our students through high school, but also to prepare our students for college or the workplace.

To increase student participation and success in high-quality courses, our budget funds activities that challenge students who are proficient, helps students who have fallen behind in core classes, and ensures that our youngest learners have a strong foundation. To measure South Carolina's progress, we will evaluate high school participation rates in college preparatory courses, dual enrollment programs, Advanced Placement courses, and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs. We measure elementary school quality by tracking participation in gifted and talented programs and IB offerings.

**3. Raise the national performance ranking of South Carolina's students on the SAT, ACT, and NAEP.**

Since 2005, South Carolina's average test scores for graduating seniors on the SAT and ACT have decreased slightly – while most other states are improving. South Carolina's scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) have improved to the point that they approach and even surpass the national average on some assessments, but we still lag in comparison to other Southeastern states. We must increase the number of students who are scoring "proficient" in every subject. The Education Accountability Act of 1998 set ambitious goals for the performance levels, with the hope that South Carolina will rank in the top half of the states on the SAT, ACT, and NAEP by 2010. With the goal's deadline now past, it is clear that the state has not made the nearly the amount of progress needed.

We will continue to measure our progress towards academic excellence by tracking student performance on NAEP, the ACT and the SAT – in terms of average score, national rank, and proficiency levels in all subject areas.

**4. Eliminate the achievement gap.**

The fact that only nine percent of African-American eighth-graders are proficient in reading on NAEP compared to 35 percent of Caucasian eighth-graders is unacceptable. Between 2003 and 2007, the achievement gap actually *widened* between African-American and Caucasian students scoring proficient on NAEP in fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math. On the 2010 SAT, there was approximately a 100-point difference between reading, math, and writing scores – of African-American and Caucasian students in South Carolina. According to the Alliance on Excellent Education, more than \$2.6 billion would be added to South Carolina's economy by 2020 if minority students graduated at the same rate as Caucasian students.

The second achievement gap is in the difference in the performance of more affluent students compared with those students from low-income homes. Our current challenge is to understand these gaps, and ultimately to raise lower-achieving students' performance level.

**5. Improve the efficiency with which education dollars are spent.**

Reaching our educational goals is directly tied to maximizing the percentage of the educational dollar spent directly in the classroom, but our current fiscal conditions require us to operate with significantly limited resources. We believe our state can make progress by eliminating expenditures on services that are not linked to specific goals, reducing or eliminating expenditures associated with activities that have poor outcomes, minimizing duplicative services, and improving productivity.

Reducing administrative overhead is another way that money could be reallocated to the classroom. According to the Census Bureau's most recent data, the amount South Carolina spends on school administration relative to personal income ranks 15<sup>th</sup> nationally and 5<sup>th</sup> among Southeastern states, ahead of North Carolina, Florida, Virginia, Louisiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee. Since we have cut in excess of \$1.8 billion from the state budget since the summer of 2008 and reduced the base student funding from \$2,578 in FY 2008-09 to \$1,630 in FY 2010-11, we must be more careful about how we spend educational funds.



Our purchase plan maintains many educational services but redirects some existing funding to activities that directly impact students and teachers in the classroom. Overall, we recommend dedicating \$1.96 billion from the general fund toward K-12 education. We believe that these dollars should be directed to the frontline of education – teachers and classrooms – which is why we are concurring with the EOC to maintain teacher salaries at the current average of \$47,642.

Because of the tough fiscal year that our state faces, the General Assembly cut millions of dollars from our K-12 education system – ultimately eroding the Base Student Cost. Although the Base Student Cost is sometimes used as the ultimate measurement of education funding, South Carolina's average per-pupil funding is \$11,651 in FY 2010-11 counting federal and local funds.

### **Purchasing Priorities**

After identifying opportunities for improvement, we next looked at the following strategies to set priorities for our purchasing plan and how best to achieve our goals:

**1. Ensure that every child is ready to enter first grade.**

If children are not adequately prepared to learn while they are young, then it becomes increasingly difficult for them to meet academic challenges as they progress through the school system. Making sure that all children are well-prepared for formal schooling requires that any developmental deficits are addressed by early childhood educational experiences. Effective early childhood programs – whether public or private – are vital for children whose home environments are not preparing them for successful elementary school experiences.

**2. Provide all students an education that equips them with the skills necessary to compete in the regional, national, and international marketplace.**

Our students must be prepared to complete high school and enter college or the workforce with the skills needed to be successful. Education is not simply an end unto itself, but a means to our ultimate goal of cultivating a productive workforce. We want our educational system to challenge students to meet high expectations while engaging them in experiences that are relevant to the real world.

**3. Provide all students with a customized learning experience.**

Before the school system can provide students with the skill sets they need, their minds have already been shaped by various societal forces. Since there are so many factors that influence how, when, and whether a child learns, it stands to reason that an effective school system will offer a multitude of learning environments to find the right fit for the students.

**4. Provide public, accessible, and timely data about the effectiveness and competitiveness of public schools in the state.**


South Carolina's existing accountability system provides report cards that help parents understand how their children's district or school compares to others. In the spring of 2008, our state made significant revisions to the accountability system. The state's standardized test, PACT, was replaced



with a new exam for students in third through eighth grades called the PASS, or Palmetto Assessment of State Standards, test. With this exam, teachers and parents receive student performance data more quickly than they received the PACT data, and thus can target how best to help a student earlier in the school year. So far, the PASS test has shown increased student scores in reading and math. From what we're hearing from teachers and local groups, the PASS test appears to be an effective evaluation.

## **Governor's Purchasing Plan – Highlights**

As we address our state's unprecedented financial problems, it is important to focus on purchasing only those education services that deliver the greatest impact on K-12 performance. In many cases, we have used cost savings methods simply to *maintain* current funding levels for high priority services. By contrast, we do not purchase services that are relatively low priorities. The following table identifies key purchases within our executive budget's total state K-12 spending plan as well as examples of what is not purchased. Detailed highlights of our purchasing plan are provided below the table.



### **Our Plan Buys:**

**Basic frontline education services for more than 700,000 students** served in the 85 school districts throughout the state, in addition to the South Carolina Public Charter School District and the Palmetto Unified District. Our plan restores funding per student according to the Education Finance Act (EFA). With funding of \$1,946 per weighted pupil unit distributed through the Base

Student Cost formula, we are granting local school districts complete funding flexibility to provide educational services to kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade students. We believe that this flexibility should be used to prioritize funds primarily to the classroom – specifically for teacher salaries. Granting school districts maximum flexibility will allow us to **maintain teacher salaries for FY 2011-12** and to fulfill our goal of driving dollars directly into the classroom.

**Creating the Palmetto Early High School Graduation Scholarship** program in order to reward students who finish high school early with grants that can offset the cost of postsecondary education or training. Beginning with the Class of 2012, students who finish high school in less than eight semesters qualify for the program. This program would provide our high-achieving students an incentive to finish coursework early, while addressing the need to eliminate the “senior year off” mentality that has become an entrenched part of the student culture in South Carolina. By **committing \$1,200,000 to the Palmetto Early High School Graduation Scholarship**, we can provide grants worth up to \$2,000 for students who finish high school in six semesters.

**Supporting the South Carolina Public Charter School District**, which offers parents more educational options for their children. Paying for facilities and transportation are the two major hurdles that charter schools face during their approval process. To help clear these hurdles, we recommend **appropriating \$1,000,000 for Infrastructure/Facilities Development** and an additional **\$500,000 for the virtual curriculum**. We propose **\$3,344,115 in total funds** to continue and expand services offered through the statewide charter schools district.

**Funding the Student Health and Fitness Act of 2005 to address** the growing obesity rate among the youth of our state. The Student Health and Fitness Act is an effort to combat the growing health problems that are emerging as a result of our students’ declining health. Starting at an early age, increasing citizen-awareness about health choices can lead to healthier lives. We propose **maintaining funds of \$27,069,341** for its continued implementation.

**Funding the Education and Economic Development Act (EEDA)** to restructure elementary and secondary school curricula to be more effective and relevant to student interests. The EEDA can increase the chances that more students in South Carolina will receive a competitive education, which will encourage students to enter postsecondary studies or enter the workplace in the field that most interests them. To support the objective of the EEDA, we **recommend funding of \$30,585,247** for this program’s seventh year of implementation.

**Supporting the South Carolina Virtual School programs** to shatter the barrier that geography places on student-access to high-quality educational experiences. Students in smaller, rural schools are currently taking advantage of rigorous courses such as advanced computer programming or Advanced Placement Calculus that would otherwise be limited to students in schools with large enrollment levels. At the same time, this program provides the opportunity for poorly-performing students to receive remedial education that the students’ assigned schools are unable to provide. Although we recommend freezing vacant positions for this program because of budget shortfalls, **we support \$2,774,717 in funding for the South Carolina Virtual School program, including an increase of \$1,000,000.**

**Providing transportation to and from school for more than 700,000 students.** We understand the need to support the state’s school transportation system, which is crucial for those students

unable to provide their own means of transportation. We propose **maintaining total funding for the transportation needs of our students at \$110,834,703**. In addition to fully funding our public school transportation system, our purchase plan provides more than \$49,851,256 in general funds for school buses and \$38,668,382 in local maintenance staff salaries. Even though we are recommending these expenditures, we continue to urge the General Assembly to look at the idea of leasing our current system. In an analysis commissioned by the Department of Education, the TransPar Group highlighted the fact that the state could reduce both the costs and the time necessary to improve the school bus replacement cycle by leasing rather than purchasing more school buses. So far, the TransPar Group's recommendations have gone largely ignored. During these tight budget times, we once again propose that the State Department of Education issue a request for proposals for lease agreements that could be used to accelerate the rate at which we replace our older buses. The leasing option will provide safer transportation to our children at a lower cost to the taxpayer.

**Assistance and accountability for underperforming schools.** The 2009 School Report Cards, issued annually by the Education Oversight Committee (EOC), make it clear that our lower-performing schools need more effective technical assistance options than are currently offered. But in a tight budget year, the Department of Education will have to find creative ways to implement effective technical assistance options. The most recent Report Cards show that 16 percent of students in South Carolina are enrolled in 185 schools with a rating of "Unsatisfactory," while nearly 24 percent of students are enrolled in the 298 schools with a rating of "Below Average." These figures make it evident that many schools are simply not improving at the rate necessary to reach the goals established by the Education Accountability Act.

Periodic exposure to high-quality teaching will not improve the student achievement in our "Below Average" and "Unsatisfactory" schools. Sustained improvements in schools that need technical assistance will not occur unless the teacher and leadership turnover issues are addressed. Put simply, these schools need access to options that will mitigate the high turnover rates that cripple the schools' efforts to improve. In order to help these schools overcome the obstacles that have limited their success, we continue to fund technical assistance with **\$58,606,518**.

**High-quality pre-school programs** that provide direct services for almost 25,000 pre-kindergarten children throughout the state. The First Steps program works with public and private institutions to improve family literacy rates, employment rates, and the quality of childcare to better prepare young students for kindergarten. We believe that by coordinating public-private community partnerships, First Steps can help prepare our children for the challenges they may face in the future education system. For this reason, we recommend **appropriating \$11.9 million** to support its efforts. Additionally, we will continue to support the Childhood Education Development Pilot Program, and we recommend funding **\$17.3 million** for this program, with administration being housed only at South Carolina First Steps.

### ***Our Plan Saves By:***

**Discontinuing National Board Certification salary bonuses** for teachers beginning the process after June 30, 2011. We accept the EOC's recommendation to discontinue these salary bonuses because our state invests more than any other state in our region in this incentive – which is not

directly tied to improving student achievement. Though it is important for the state to honor the commitment made to teachers who have already completed the process, we believe that expanding the program to newly certified teachers in FY 2011-12 would be an irresponsible use of state funding during times of economic downturn, especially when these bonuses are not limited to teachers working in low-performing schools or teaching critical subjects. In FY 2010-11, the state committed \$53.4 million for National Board incentives. As of December 2010, 498 teachers achieved National Board Certification in South Carolina this year. Discontinuing the bonus will result in a **cost savings of \$2,750,000 this year alone. Additionally, 244 certified teachers are scheduled to end their 10 year certification on June 30, 2011. Discontinuing any further incentive payments to these teachers saves an additional \$2,205,760.**

**Eliminating funding for assessments, evaluation, and review of the High Schools that Work model and Making Middle Grades Work model through the EEDA.** When the economic downturn began, State Department of Education officials recommended suspending any assessments that were not required by federal regulations. The assessments required by High Schools that Work and Making Middle Grades Work fell in this category. Additionally, the budget cuts this year have forced us to reevaluate the sheer number of programs aimed at raising high school achievement and graduation rates. Because the budget cuts this year have been so dramatic, and because the Department has undertaken new achievement and assessment programs like the Core Standards initiative, we recommend eliminating funding for High Schools that Work and Making Middle Grades Work this fiscal year. Our proposal results in a **cost savings of \$1,648,937.**

### **Making Tough Choices:**

The current economic challenges have forced many South Carolinians to make some serious decisions about how they will spend their personal income. Similar to the challenges facing households across South Carolina, the state's limited resources require that we make difficult choices about how we will direct our spending during FY 2011-12. These choices reflect our desire to be fiscally responsible with taxpayer dollars by limiting government spending to high-priority activities. The following items represent some of the difficult choices we've made on educational activities that we chose not to purchase in this year's executive budget.

**Eliminating the ADEPT program.** The Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching (ADEPT) program, which is similar to the National Board Certification process, has the potential to improve teacher development throughout South Carolina. However, it is duplicative of – and less effective than – other development programs that the state currently offers. For instance, the Teacher Advancement Program and the South Carolina Teacher Incentive Grant program each offer valuable teacher development services and are directly tied to academic gains in student performance. Because other, more successful programs exist, there is no need for our state to fund the ADEPT program. This will result in a **cost savings of \$1,747,818.**

*Please see the Appendices for a complete listing of the Governor's Purchase Plan for this goal area and for a detailed listing of what our plan saves and what our plan does not buy.*

Improve Our Higher Education  
System and Cultural Resources

## Improve Our Higher Education System and Cultural Resources

Our goals for South Carolina's higher education system are: to better prepare our workforce for the challenges of a competitive global marketplace; raise the standard of living for South Carolinians; meet changing workforce needs; and encourage economic growth. The challenge is to achieve these goals with dwindling resources. We want to give more South Carolinians access our higher education system – and ultimately improve that system – so they can excel in an increasingly competitive job market.

At a time when families are making tough decisions on household spending, we want higher education to be a realistic option for South Carolinians, which is why we support increasing aid for needs-based grants. We also believe that our higher education system will remain unaffordable and inefficient if South Carolina's 33 public colleges and universities continue to operate independently without the guidance of a coordinated statewide plan. By coordinating our higher education efforts, we can eliminate duplication and allow the institutions to have distinct missions, together serving the educational needs of our citizens.

Our mission for higher education is simple: to provide a high quality education at an affordable price for our citizens. The result will be greater accessibility for more students in our state who want an opportunity to achieve a higher quality of life.

In addition, our citizens enjoy a variety of cultural resources through our state's historic sites, arts agencies, and museums. Our state is fortunate to have rich cultural opportunities, and we want to maximize private and nonprofit interaction to enhance our many wonderful community arts and cultural programs.

### Developing Our Purchasing Priorities

To develop our purchasing priorities, we first looked at major indicators that help determine whether state government is currently reaching its goal of improving our higher education system and cultural resources. While South Carolina is making progress, there are many areas that need improvement.

#### Administration's Goals for Improving Our Higher Education System and Cultural Resources:

- ✓ Improve the access and affordability of our Higher Education system.
- ✓ Encourage increased employment and quality of life opportunities for graduates.
- ✓ Create an efficient and effective statewide higher education system by establishing a Board of Regents.
- ✓ Provide a greater number of cultural opportunities in South Carolina.



### *Where We Are Succeeding*

There are many reasons for South Carolinians to be proud of our higher education system. Our technical college system is internationally recognized for its programs that advance workforce development, and our universities have strong reputations for the productivity and quality of their services. Here are a few highlights from the past year:

- Clemson University was again recognized as one of the top public universities in the country.
- The University of South Carolina's Moore School of Business was ranked as a top business school, while the undergraduate international business program has been ranked in the top three of all institutions for 21 consecutive years.
- The University of South Carolina-Upstate is in its fourth year of offering the Scholars Academy, a competitive tuition-free program that provides on-site dual enrollment courses for academically advanced high school students from participating school districts in Spartanburg County.
- The Citadel was ranked by *U.S. News and World Reports* as the number one best value and number two public college overall in the South for master's-granting institutions, while the University of Charleston and Winthrop University were both ranked in the top 10.
- The success of readySC, a division of the Technical College System, in training existing high tech aerospace employees was critical in attracting Boeing to South Carolina.
- 1,407 Citadel graduates have served the United States in the global war on terror, including the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Additionally, enrollment in South Carolina's higher education system is increasing. In our public institutions, enrollment grew by 19.9 percent between 1999 and 2008. The percentage of South Carolinians attending public universities in South Carolina increased by 14.2 percent over that period. As a result, the number of degrees awarded has steadily risen at all levels of higher education. Over the last decade, we have experienced a more than 28 percent increase in the total number of degrees awarded by our colleges, universities, and technical colleges. Additionally, African-American enrollment at our colleges, universities and technical colleges increased 33 percent between 1999 and 2009. Our technical college system saw a 19 percent increase in enrollment between 2007 and 2009, but the cause may be two-fold. First, more South Carolinians are realizing the value of obtaining a postsecondary degree at technical colleges to increase employability. Second, technical college enrollment has historically increased during economic downturns. The latter reason likely explains the enrollment increase, according to officials at the State Technical and Comprehensive Education Board, which means we must make higher education more accessible, affordable, and effective for our citizens.



*Opportunities for Improvement*


To achieve our goals of preparing our workforce for the global economy, our institutions of higher education must keep up with workforce needs. This administration has focused on attracting higher-paying, knowledge-based jobs. In order to be more successful at attracting businesses to our state, we need well-prepared graduates with various levels of education. If our state is going to be more competitive, then we must increase the number of skilled workers currently available in the workforce. Increasing the number of skilled workers means that more citizens need access to our higher education system, but unfortunately, rising tuition costs are making postsecondary education less accessible for many people in our state.

*Rising Costs of Higher Education*

In 2007, the General Assembly authorized a Higher Education Study Committee to take a holistic look at higher education in the state and recommend a multi-year statewide plan for higher education. The study committee released a report in September 2008 outlining four goals to ensure our state's competitiveness in the knowledge economy. The committee's first goal was to make South Carolina one of the most educated states, and making college affordable is one way to achieve this goal. The committee found that college affordability is shutting out many low-income families who would benefit from postsecondary education.

Offering first-class educational programs is useless if our citizens cannot afford to attend college. Double-digit percentage tuition increases at some colleges and near double-digit percentage hikes at others over the last year is putting higher education out of reach for many in our state. According to data from the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics, South Carolina's in-state tuition at our research universities grew 166.5 percent between 1999 and 2008, to an average of \$9,608 in 2008. This rate of growth led the Southeast. Indeed, average in-state tuition was 23 percent higher than the next highest state in the region, Tennessee. The picture is not much better at our non-research, comprehensive colleges – Coastal Carolina, Winthrop, College of Charleston, among others. Tuition at these colleges grew by 138.1 percent between 1999 and 2008, to an average of \$8,338 per year. The rate of growth at these institutions was by far the highest in the Southeast, outpacing the region's second highest (Virginia) by 16 percent. Between 1999 and 2008, South Carolina's per capita personal income grew by only 40 percent. Similarly, inflation increased by just 29 percent between 1999 and 2008. In other words, tuition is increasing much faster than South Carolinians' ability to pay for it.

## In-State Tuition Growth between 1999-2008




Source: SREB

Certain universities have been more egregious in raising tuition than others. The Citadel, for instance, increased tuition 13 percent between fall of 2009 and fall of 2010. All of this at a time when inflation is about 1 percent annually and per capita personal income actually dropped in South Carolina due to the current economic slowdown. Yet these massive tuition increases are not a new development.

Despite the fact that tuition has increased by 166.5 percent at South Carolina's major research institutions, and 138 percent at our smaller public colleges, state funding per full time equivalent student increased 26 percent between 2000 and 2008 (including state appropriations, grants, scholarships and money from the Education Lottery). In fact, despite claims from certain segments, South Carolina leads the Southeast in per-capita scholarship assistance – nearly 20 percent higher than Georgia, the next highest in the region.

Additionally, only four states nationally spend more as a percentage of its state budget on higher education than South Carolina, according to the National Association of State Budget Officers. In 2008, South Carolina spent 20.6 percent of its budget on higher education – nearly twice the U.S. average. Among the Southeastern states, only Kentucky spent more as a percentage of its budget on higher education than South Carolina.

### Higher Education Spending as a Percentage of State Budget - FY 2008



Source: National Association of State Budget Officers

The most common reason that the higher education institutions give for the massive tuition increases that our citizens have seen over the last decade is that the increases were necessary to offset decreases in state appropriations. A glance at the data reveals a different story. Nearly every college has raised tuition at levels that outpace the amount of reduction that each school has seen in the level of state appropriations. In fact, many of the colleges were raising their tuition rates even while they were receiving *increases* in their state appropriations – sometimes while receiving the highest level of state funding *ever*.

Since the 2004-05 academic year, USC's state appropriation has decreased about \$48 million. At the same time, however, they have raised tuition by more than \$65 million – a difference of more than \$17 million. USC also received more than \$50 million stimulus funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) over the last two years. Similarly, between fall of 2004 and spring of 2010, Clemson's state funding has been reduced by \$7.5 million yet, like USC, Clemson has raised almost \$72 million in tuition increases – a difference of almost *\$65 million*. Additionally, Clemson received more than \$31 million in stimulus funds. At the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC), state appropriations are down by a little more than \$37 million since 2001, yet MUSC has generated more than \$54 million in tuition – an increase of more than \$17 million, while also receiving more than \$26 million in stimulus funds.

Since 2001, state appropriations to the College of Charleston are down, on net, a little more than \$11 million. Over the same period, however, the College of Charleston generated more than \$78

million in tuition increases – a difference of more than \$67 million. Finally, at the Citadel, state appropriations are down about \$8 million over the last 10 years, yet tuition increases over the same period generated almost \$16.5 million – a difference of almost \$8.5 million. Over last two years, the Citadel received more than \$4.5 million in ARRA funds. While it is true that, on net, state appropriations to colleges and universities have marginally decreased, tuition increases have far outpaced the decrease in state aid – while also pricing many South Carolina families out of the higher education market.


**Difference in Tuition Increases vs. State Funding Cuts Fiscal Years 2005-2011**

Institution	Decrease in State Aid	Tuition Increase	Difference	Stimulus Funds
USC	\$48,378,539	\$65,866,198	\$17,487,659	\$50,838,670
Clemson	\$7,440,577	\$71,900,919	\$64,460,342	\$31,176,525
MUSC	\$28,274,896	\$42,957,289	\$14,682,393	\$26,872,367
Charleston	\$7,369,967	\$51,917,436	\$44,547,469	\$9,680,503
SC State	\$3,500,213	\$13,856,041	\$10,355,828	\$6,712,557
The Citadel	\$5,136,258	\$12,356,579	\$7,220,321	\$4,525,047

Source: State Budget Office and Higher Education Institutions

What, then, is the primary driver of the skyrocketing costs at South Carolina's colleges and universities? One answer is entirely predictable – administrative growth. In August 2010, the Goldwater Institute released a study documenting bloat in administrative positions and spending at the nation's largest research universities. The results are striking.

**Percent Growth in Number of Administrators per 100 Students  
(1993-2007)**




Source: Goldwater Institute using IPEDS Data

Between 1993 and 2007, the number of administrators at the University of South Carolina increased by almost 95 percent – the largest percentage increase of any flagship public university in the

Southeast. In raw numbers, USC had 3.7 administrators per 100 students in 1993; by 2007, that figure had ballooned to 7.3 administrators per 100 students. As the chart above demonstrates, USC's administrative growth was 140 percent higher than the national average over that period. To their credit, Clemson's administrative growth is toward the low end of all public research universities in the Southeast, and well below the national average. The chart above includes public, flagship universities in the region.

Despite the increase in state funding and tuition, USC and Clemson are still below the national average for the number of full-time employees dedicated to teaching and research.



The chart above shows the hard numbers of full-time employees dedicated to teaching and research at flagship universities in the Southeast. In 2007, USC has 5.6 full time employees dedicated to teaching and research per 100 students – 25 percent less than the national average. In 2007, Clemson had 6.4 full-time employees per 100 students dedicated to teaching and research – 9 percent less than the national average. More troubling is that between 1993 and 2007, Clemson actually cut the number of full-time employees dedicated to instruction and research per 100 – from 6.6 in 1993 to 6.4 in 2007. While the University of South Carolina did increase the number of full-time employees dedicated to teaching and research per 100 students between 1993 and 2007, the increase was less than 4 percent – from 5.4 in 1993 to 5.6 in 2007.

In other words, as tuition skyrocketed and state spending on education increased, colleges and universities spent their additional resources growing bureaucracy – hiring more administrators – not hiring more faculty or researchers.

To combat these overwhelming increases, in September 2010, the Budget and Control Board passed a requirement that until state colleges and universities keep yearly tuition increases at or below the South Atlantic Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) – 7 percent for 2010-11 – the Board would not approve new building construction expenditures. The HEPI is an index that measures yearly price inflation increases at colleges and universities in the United States. Specifically, the index draws distinctions across the various regions of the country as well as measures other cost drivers in higher education. For years, our executive budget has included a recommendation that, if enacted by the General Assembly, would prevent colleges and universities from increasing tuition beyond the yearly HEPI figure.

In response to the Board's action, the College of Charleston, Clemson University and the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC), among others, lowered their tuition increases for the spring 2011 semester. This was a welcome and positive development.

### *The Need for Reform*

While the Budget and Control Board's action was a necessary first step, more action is needed to ensure access to higher education for South Carolina's families. In FY 1998-99, an in-state student at Winthrop University paid \$4,000 a year in tuition. In today's unstable economy, that same student is being asked to pay more than \$12,000. Dramatic tuition increases like this have taken their toll on the average student's ability to obtain an advanced degree. In fact, the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education gave South Carolina an "F" in its most recent report on affordability of higher education, "Measuring Up 2008." This report is published every two years, and in three consecutive reports, South Carolina has received the lowest possible grade for college affordability. Even after receiving aid, poor and working-class families devote 34 percent of their annual family incomes to attend public four-year colleges, according to the report.

Although some would attribute our tuition increases to reductions in state funding over the past two fiscal years, as mentioned above, only four states spend a greater percentage of their total budget on higher education, according to the National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO). In addition, in 2009-10, the state spent 13.4 percent of the revenue it brought in through taxes on higher education, according to the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). This means that South Carolina ranks 10<sup>th</sup> nationally in the percentage of state taxes are appropriated to higher education. Our administration believes that taxpayers are spending enough on postsecondary education in our state, and we should be questioning the manner in which these dollars are being allocated, especially in light of our looming budget shortfall.

With 33 public colleges and universities operating at more than 50 different campus locations, our state maintains too many postsecondary institutions with overlapping programs. Because the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) has little oversight authority, the political process has created too many schools that operate with too few students. While this growth occurred with the intent of making higher education more accessible to everyone in our state, our inefficient system of underutilized campuses and administrative growth has made higher education *less* accessible. At a time when all state agencies weathered harsh budget cuts – and economists project a grim economic

outlook for the next year – it is critical that we scale down the number of higher education facilities in this state.

### **Purchasing Priorities**

We developed our purchasing plan by prioritizing activities using proven or promising strategies that achieve the best results for our goal. The key strategies we identified are:

**1. Provide for an efficient and effective statewide higher education system by creating a Board of Regents.**

Our current higher education structure includes 17 public universities and 16 technical colleges, each with an independent mission and focus, and each controlled by its own governing board of trustees. Although each campus is unique and desires to maintain its own identity, the absence of a unified plan for higher education has promoted a lack of focus within and between our institutions. During the past few years, we have seen a few examples of our need for a unified statewide educational plan:

- USC-Sumter circumvented the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) by seeking special authorization to move from two-year to four-year status. The CHE – the coordinating body charged with effectively advocating for the best interests of the state system as a whole – did not approve this action.
- USC-Upstate entered into an agreement with Greenville Technical College to build a USC-Upstate satellite campus in the Greenville area. This action undermines the purpose of the University Center of Greenville, which is a consortium of colleges in the Greenville area collaborating to offer four-year degrees to area residents.


In both of the above instances, the universities initiated their projects without notifying CHE because the Commission's approval was either unwanted or unnecessary. These structural weaknesses and lack of planning will continue to contribute to rising costs and duplication in the higher education system, so we propose once again that South Carolina establish a Board of Regents as part of a statewide plan for higher education in South Carolina.

The primary goal of South Carolina's public colleges and universities ought to be to provide good quality, affordable college education to South Carolinians. Based on the available data for other states with Boards of Regents, creating such an institution would help accomplish that goal. There are currently 16 states with Boards of Regents, including Tennessee, Florida and Louisiana in the Southeast. In 2009-10, average in-state tuition in South Carolina was higher than every state with a Board of Regents. Further, not only do states with Boards of Regents have lower in-state tuition than South Carolina, but they also do a better job of controlling the influx of out-of-state students enrolled in the respective state's public colleges and universities.

In 1999, the average tuition at all South Carolina's public colleges and universities was \$3,637; by 2009, average tuition in South Carolina was \$9,524, which led the Southeast. That is an increase of



147 percent. In Tennessee, average tuition grew by 110 percent over that period. In Florida, tuition increased 48 percent between 1999 and 2010, and in Louisiana, average in-state tuition increased 67 percent during that same period.



Additionally, states with Boards of Regents were better able to control the migration of out-of-state students into their public colleges and universities to ensure that the public colleges principally served state taxpayers.

In 2009, South Carolina led the Southeast in percentage of out-of-state students enrolled in public colleges and universities at 28 percent. This would not be a problem if every out-of-state student paid out-of-state tuition. According to the most recent data from the Commission on Higher Education, however, only 70.3 percent of out-of-state students attending public colleges and universities paid out-of-state tuition rates in 2009. At USC, for example, a mere 43.2 percent of out-of-state students pay out-of-state tuition. This means South Carolina taxpayers are subsidizing students from all over the country to attend our public colleges and universities.

Between 1999 and 2008, in-state enrollment grew by 14.2 percent and out-of-state enrollment grew by 37.4 percent at South Carolina's public colleges and universities. In Florida, in-state enrollment grew by 41.4 percent while out-of-state enrollment declined by 24.1 percent over the same period. It is clear, therefore, that states with Boards of Regents better control costs and enrollment.

In light of our bleak economic outlook, now is the time to make permanent changes that will strengthen our higher education system. We strongly encourage the General Assembly to create a



Board of Regents to oversee South Carolina's 17 public universities. The board would develop a coordinated higher education system and would supervise all affairs of the constituent institutions. Additionally, we believe it is important that the South Carolina Board of Regents be allowed to set tuition and enrollment levels at the institutions, so we can ensure that college is affordable and accessible for our students.

**2. Ensure access to and affordability of higher education.**

The current credit crisis has made it more difficult than ever for students to obtain loans for college, so we must ensure that higher education is affordable. As mentioned above, the Budget and Control Board conditioned approval of new capital projects on colleges and universities keeping tuition increases at or below the South Atlantic Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) inflation rate. While certain colleges and tech schools remain resistant to scaling back tuition increases, other colleges and universities have, in fact, cut back on exorbitant tuition increases. This was a good first step. We believe, however, that more can be done to control costs. As we have urged throughout this administration, the state can further slow the growth of tuition costs at *all* state colleges and universities by limiting tuition increases for in-state, undergraduate students to the South Atlantic HEPI inflation rate Higher Education Price Index per academic year, beginning with the 2011 fall semester. Simply put, institutions of higher learning can control costs by coordinating duplicative programs, and by finding internal cost savings – such as scaling back on the administrative explosion we have witnessed over the last 15 years.

Finally, we can also limit the growth and mission creep of our 17 public universities by strengthening the Commission on Higher Education – or creating a Board of Regents – and developing a statewide plan for higher education in South Carolina.

**3. Increase the employability of graduates.**

Earning a degree is a measure of achievement and an indication of practical ability. However, today's economy requires more than just a diploma and a presumed proficiency. Graduates must have life skills, technology training, and communication strengths to go with their academic credentials as they prepare to become productive citizens. Also, the state needs ensure students are aware of the employment opportunities available in South Carolina, in addition to being aware of the majors our universities offer. While student choice is a cornerstone of the academic experience, we must be certain that students have a realistic understanding of the workplace and how their academic choices can impact their ultimate ability to support themselves.

Increasing the employability of graduates will play a major role in improving the economic climate of our state. Apprenticeship Carolina is a part of the technical college system. The program gives technical college students on-the-job training with the prospect of a job offer upon graduation. The program is in its third year of operation, and the number of apprentices has increased from 777 in July 2007 to 2660 currently in the program – an increase of 242 percent. This program is helping to create a larger pool of qualified workers in the areas of health care, tourism, and advanced manufacturing. We will continue to support programs that help South Carolina become an

attractive option for potential employers and that will attract businesses, and higher paying jobs, to our area.

**4. Increase the effectiveness and efficiency of cultural opportunities and agencies through consolidation of duplicative services.**


This administration continues to believe that duplicating government services is a misuse of taxpayer money. Our cultural agencies can combine efforts and save taxpayer dollars by sharing building space and streamlining administration functions. The State Library, Arts Commission, State Museum, and Department of Archives and History have begun sharing human resource functions. This is a positive development.

**5. Increase awareness of available cultural opportunities through a coordinated marketing effort linked to tourism.**

Our state's historic sites, arts agencies, and museums must be marketed in full cooperation with our tourism regions. The state's cultural resources complement our natural attractions, helping to make South Carolina a prime destination for visitors, potential college students, and residents. We believe careful and constructive marketing would not only draw more attention to these sites, but would also attract capital investment and create jobs.

## **Governor's Purchasing Plan – Highlights**

As we address our state's unprecedented financial problems, it is important to focus on purchasing only those higher education services that deliver the greatest impact on improving higher education and promoting our cultural resources. In many cases, we have had to use cost savings methods to simply *maintain* current funding levels for high priority services. We do not purchase services that, although valuable, have been identified as lower priorities. The following table identifies key purchases within our executive budget's total state higher education spending plan as well as examples of what is not purchased. Detailed highlights of our purchasing plan are provided below the table.



### **Our Plan Buys:**

Educational and general funding for our state's 33 two-year and four-year campuses, research universities, and technical colleges. This activity provides the core support for the operation of the higher education system in our state. We will once again recommend a proviso that limits tuition and fee increases to the prior year's HEPI index figure. We propose funding these activities in the amount of **\$338,899,810 in recurring general funds**.

**Program coordination and oversight by the Commission on Higher Education.** The CHE, while limited in authority, reviews academic and scholarship programs, collects relevant educational

data, and coordinates school facility usage. Until the CHE is given more authority, or until a Board of Regents is established, we propose **recurring general funding** in the amount of **\$117,845,812**.

**Scholarship programs at all levels.**

The LIFE, HOPE, and Palmetto Fellows scholarships, along with needs-based grants, help parents and students pay for tuition. Our focus this year will be on increasing funding for needs-based grants, while maintaining funds for other state-supported scholarships. Our state has an imbalance in that we offer more merit-based scholarships than needs-based, and in today's world, an ever-increasing number of students need financial assistance because of their limited family income. In the fall of 2008, the South Carolina Higher Education Study Committee issued a report which stated that "our financial aid portfolio is not balanced between need and merit, with the result that many students from poor families cannot afford to attend. Yet it is precisely from these families that much of South Carolina's increased participation must come."

Additionally, we propose that the overall scholarship program be reevaluated to strengthen the qualifications for receipt of scholarship assistance. Far too many freshmen are becoming ineligible for scholarship retention because they were unprepared for the academic challenges of higher education. If the trends in our state continue as they have in recent years, less than 50 percent of the students who received a LIFE scholarship in the fall of 2010 will retain it in the fall of 2011. However, it is our priority to offer a greater level of affordability to higher education students. Therefore, we propose allocating lottery and general funds appropriated to these scholarship and grant awards as follows:

- **Needs-Based Grants** for total funding of **\$23.6 million**.
- **LIFE Scholarships** for total funding of **\$179.8 million**.
- **Palmetto Fellows Scholarships** for total funding of **\$54.3 million**.
- **Hope Scholarships** for total funding of **\$8.5 million**.

**Tuition grants for students attending private colleges in South Carolina.** This investment is returned many times over by using the capacity of private schools instead of additional "bricks and mortar" at state-supported colleges and universities. Since its inception in 1970, the tuition grants program has provided assistance to over 325,000 South Carolina students, totaling more \$700 million. We propose **funding in the amount of \$24,991,900 in recurring general funds** and **\$38,094,164 in total funds**.

**The Lottery Tuition Assistance Program for students at two-year technical colleges.** Each student is awarded a scholarship based upon the number of eligible recipients, and the amount of available funding each year is limited to the cost of tuition. We propose **funding in the amount of \$47 million in lottery funds**.

***Our Plan Saves By:***

**Consolidating administrative functions of the South Carolina Technical Colleges.** Since the start of the economic downturn, the technical colleges have not had to absorb their share of our

state's \$1.8 billion budget cuts. One way for the technical colleges to save money going forward is to consolidate the administration of our 16 technical colleges into three regions. We recommend housing the schools' central administrations at Greenville, Midlands, and Trident technical colleges – because they have the largest enrollments – with the merger and proposed cost savings as follows:

<u>Upstate-region</u> <u>(Greenville)</u>	<u>Midlands-region</u> <u>(Midlands)</u>	<u>Low-Country-region</u> <u>(Trident)</u>
Piedmont: \$993,561	Aiken: \$1,049,995	Horry-Georgetown: \$1,753,378
Spartanburg: \$983,375	Orangeburg-Calhoun: \$1,034,237	Williamsburg: \$289,967
York: \$1,251,293	Denmark: \$592,355	Florence-Darlington: \$2,998,466
Tri-County: \$2,010,356	Central Carolina: \$993,963	Technical College of the Lowcountry: \$1,166,958
Northeastern: \$707,690		

Consolidating school administration will produce cost savings by reducing the number of staff members responsible for executive-level administration, financial aid services, Information Technology support, and procurement services. However, we believe it is important for each college to retain its name and its president because each school has an established presence in its surrounding community.

Georgia approved a similar consolidation in October 2008, which merged 13 technical colleges into six, saving the state an estimated \$3.5 million. Even the distance between schools should not discourage consolidation – Valdosta and Central technical colleges in Georgia will consolidate although they are 70 miles apart.

Our proposal, including employee benefits, would save an estimated \$22.6 million. In lean budget years, we encourage the Technical College System to adopt our proposal, or to create and implement a similar proposal that would realize equal cost savings.


**Consolidating administrative functions of the four-year colleges, excluding the three research institutions.** In light of the significant budget reductions higher education institutions have faced over the last year, we believe it is more important now than ever before to streamline administrative functions. We propose that the administrative functions of Winthrop, The Citadel, Lander, Coastal Carolina, the College of Charleston, Francis Marion, and South Carolina State universities be administered in Columbia at the Commission on Higher Education. Consolidating school administration will produce cost savings by reducing the number of staff members responsible for executive-level administration, financial aid services, Information Technology support, and procurement services. However, as with our technical college proposal, we believe it is important for each college to retain its name and its president because each school has an

established presence in its surrounding community. Our proposal would **save an estimated \$12 million.**

Additionally, we recommend that our third research institution – the University of South Carolina at Columbia – perform all executive-level administrative functions for the entire USC system, which are currently performed by each satellite campus.

**Ensuring colleges and universities keep tuition increases in check.** In September 2010, the Budget and Control Board decided it would not approve new capital expenditures until colleges and universities kept tuition increases under the HEPI Index for the South Atlantic region – seven percent this year. Most colleges and universities complied and scaled back tuition increases. The Citadel, however, did not. As a result, we recommend cutting the Citadel’s budget by the amount of revenue they generated in tuition increases above what the HEPI Index would have permitted. This will provide general fund savings of **\$906,379.**

**Facilities and Maintenance Cluster Initiative.** Collaborating maintenance and facility operations will yield significant savings without weakening the quality of the participating institutions. As indicated by the map below, many of our state’s four-year institutions are located within close proximity to another four-year institution or a technical college, yet these institutions have their own independent facilities and maintenance staff. For example, MUSC, The Citadel, and the College of Charleston are located within three miles of one another, yet all three schools have separate facilities and maintenance staff. We believe that with three separate entities in such close proximity providing similar services, there are opportunities to combine facilities and maintenance operations and reduce costs. These opportunities exist throughout our higher education system, and we encourage institutions within a 25-mile radius of one another to reduce the costs associated with their facilities and maintenance activities. We are encouraged to hear that steps are being taken in this direction, as Internet Technology directors from the public and private colleges are currently discussing ways to share IT resources. By reducing costs to the participating universities, we will prevent significant tuition increases for our state’s students and families. This initiative will provide **\$8,512,641** of general fund **savings.**



**Cutting state funding for college lobbyists.** At a time when all state agencies are facing extreme budget cuts, we do not believe it is essential that the state continue funding university lobbyists. For example, 15 institutions of higher education employ lobbyists – paying salaries, lobbying fees, support staff, and rent. According to a recent report, since 2009, the University of South Carolina and Clemson University have spent more than \$900,000 combined on federal lobbying alone. Since 2006, Clemson University has spent \$985,871 on lobbying the federal government. The University of South Carolina has spent \$870,000 on federal lobbying since 2006. This does not even account for the amount the colleges and universities spent lobbying at the state level. If public colleges choose to support lobbyists, then they should do so with foundation or other funds, but not at an expense to the state's taxpayers. We estimate eliminating lobbying by higher education and other agencies will produce cost savings of \$1,264,567 in general funds.

**Consolidating the Cultural and Arts Agencies.** Our executive budget recommends eliminating the Arts Commission. If the General Assembly continues to fund the Arts Commission, we recommend moving it into the State Museum. We project savings of \$163,134 in recurring general funds by reducing space requirements, systems duplication, and equipment.

**Terminating the Lease of the Tuition Grants facility.** Based on the recent cuts to the Tuition Grants Commission, we do not believe that the agency has sufficient funds to meet the obligations of its current lease, which allows the Commission to cancel the lease without penalty upon the approval of the Budget and Control Board. There are only three employees that work with Tuition Grants, and we believe they could effectively carry out their mission by sharing space with another



state agency. Tuition Grants officials sought space inside the Commission on Higher Education in 2000, but CHE at that time said there was no available space. Therefore, Tuition Grants employees are locked into a contract at their current location until 2012. We think it is unnecessary for the state to pay operations, leasing, and maintenance costs on a building that serves only three people. Tuition Grants could easily share space with another state agency like the State Department of Education, which currently has 164 vacant positions and probably has extra office space. Cost savings from this consolidation will amount to **\$20,700**.

**Consolidating the Institute for Archeology and Anthropology into the Department of Archives and History (DAH).** The Institute's function could be easily absorbed and housed at DAH, particularly since DAH has adequate physical space and because the Institute and DAH share the overall mission of cultural preservation. Most of our neighboring states (Alabama, Virginia, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana) house their Archeology programs at their equivalent of our Department of Archives and History. Annual savings will amount to \$496,812.

### **Making Tough Choices:**

Given the state's limited resources, we had to make some difficult choices regarding which activities to fund. While the activities listed below have merit, we did not think their anticipated outcomes would be as effective when compared to other activities. The following activities reflect some of those difficult choices:

**Community Service Programs through the State Technical College System.** While community service programs are a noble effort to cultivate responsible citizenship, we must fund only those activities that are essential to the colleges' mission. This program offers non-credit courses to community members at all 16 technical colleges. Participants pay for the courses, which are day-long seminars on art, history, homeland security, or topics related to the local community. Currently, state funds support a portion of instructors' salaries, but we believe the significant user fees generated by this program – over \$3 million – are sufficient to support the program without the need for additional state funds. This will result in a **savings of \$547,704** in general funds.

**University Center of Greenville** is a consortium of public and private colleges and universities offering undergraduate and graduate degree programs to the citizens of the Upstate. We support this type of collaboration, particularly when our current higher education system is full of duplicative programs. However, with seven institutions participating in the Center – including Clemson, Furman, MUSC, USC-Columbia, USC-Upstate, South Carolina State University, and Lander – we believe the participating colleges should be able to cover the University Center's operating costs. This will result in **savings \$1,122,021**.

*Please see the Appendices for a complete listing of the Governor's Purchase Plan for this goal area and for a detailed listing of what our plan saves and what our plan does not buy.*



Improve the Conditions for  
Economic Growth

## Improve the Conditions for Economic Growth

Since the beginning of our administration, we have worked toward making South Carolina the best business climate possible for large capital investment and jobs – offering reforms that will keep South Carolina moving forward in today’s global economy.

Economic growth is a high priority for our administration, and we are proud of our Department of Commerce’s successes in attracting large-scale capital investment projects over the last eight years. In 2009, despite the economic slowdown, South Carolina had \$2.383 billion in capital investment and led the Southeast in job recruitment. On a per-capita basis, South Carolina had \$526 per person in capital investment in 2009 – 70 percent higher than North Carolina which had \$309 per person. For the last seven years, the Pollina Corporation has ranked South Carolina in the top 5 business-friendly states. 2010 is no different; Pollina ranked South Carolina 4<sup>th</sup> in the country.

### Administration’s Goals for Improving the Conditions for Economic Growth:

- ✓ Capital investment growth.
- ✓ Small business community growth.
- ✓ Provide jobs for existing workforce.
- ✓ Increase personal income.

The global economy evolves on a daily basis, creating new markets and new ways of doing business. Unlike year’s past, when South Carolina competed with only its regional or national neighbors, our state now competes globally – against countries like China and India that continue to train their workforces and develop their abilities to compete across a broad spectrum of industries. Given this ever-changing global economy and the current global financial crisis, we believe it is necessary to continue to enhance South Carolina’s competitive position.

While our administration has been consistent in its commitment to create a friendlier business climate in South Carolina, it is crucial that the state provide the Department of Commerce and other development-related agencies with the tools to attract to our state companies looking to begin or expand their operations.

### Developing Our Purchasing Priorities

To develop our purchasing priorities, we first examined the major indicators of success to determine whether state government is currently reaching its goal of improving the conditions for economic growth. We have found that South Carolina is making significant progress, but there are areas that need improvement. Our major funding priorities are those that will best achieve our goal of improving the conditions for economic growth:

Provide for the growth and sustainability of all communities through broad-based incentives and grants programs. South Carolina’s approach to economic and competitive challenges in South Carolina should be holistic rather than piecemeal. We want to increase the potential for *all* South Carolinians to benefit from this administration’s economic development efforts. Providing for

consistent and continued success throughout South Carolina is a vital step toward global competitiveness. We support the Department of Commerce's efforts to determine how best to facilitate our state's economic growth.

Provide a more unified and focused effort in marketing our state's assets. South Carolina will maintain its reputation as a business-friendly environment by continuing to promote its strengths while working to minimize or eliminate its weaknesses. Marketing the positive aspects of living and working in the Palmetto State provides tangible benefits – every dollar properly invested in marketing returns more than \$20 in direct tourism spending to the economy. Continually emphasizing South Carolina's superior tourist destinations and business-friendly climate will serve to bring in tourism and capital investment projects, both of which create jobs for South Carolinians.

Provide resources and infrastructure for a more skilled and prepared workforce. South Carolina is consistently recognized for its ability to prepare its workforce for the highly-skilled jobs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Through the Center for Accelerated Technology Training, and its programs that work to supply businesses' labor needs, South Carolina continues to provide top-level training for the jobs created by emerging technologies. To continue our economic development efforts in workforce development, we remain focused on streamlining the allocation of workforce development dollars through the Department of Commerce's Workforce Development Division.

### ***Where We Are Succeeding***


In 2010, the Cato Institute released its biennial Fiscal Policy Report Card on America's Governors. The study focused on fiscal policy since 2008. Four administrations received an "A" for their fiscal policies, according to the Report Card: our administration, along with the administrations in Louisiana, Minnesota and West Virginia. Of the four administrations to receive an "A" grade, our administration received the highest overall score. In commenting on our administration's fiscal policy, Cato said, "[Our administration] has been a staunch supporter of spending restraint and pro-growth tax reforms."

The report card was broken down into two categories – tax and spending policies. While our administration scored highly in both categories, we received the highest score on the spending restraint portion of the scorecard due to our persistent advocacy of less government spending. As Nobel Laureate and University of Chicago economics professor Milton Friedman never tired of saying, "Remember, to spend is to tax." In other words, spending drives taxation; and spending restraint makes tax cuts possible. Anytime government spends, it must tax the private economy – taking dollars away from the pool of capital available to the private sector. That is but one reason we have spent the last eight years arguing that government spending is holding back stronger private sector growth.

### **Job Recruitment and Capital Investment**

From the beginning of our administration, the Department of Commerce has been recruiting jobs and capital investment to South Carolina at a robust pace. In 2009, South Carolina's Department of Commerce led the Southeast with 18,004 jobs recruited. South Carolina also led the Southeast on a per-capita basis.

### Jobs Recruited Per 10,000 Residents (2009)



Source: South Carolina Department of Commerce

	Jobs Recruited 2009
<b>South Carolina</b>	<b>18,004</b>
Virginia	15,534
Georgia	16,967
Tennessee	16,700
Kentucky	6,687
Mississippi	7,768
North Carolina	16,709
Alabama	16,673
Louisiana	8,724

Source: South Carolina Department of Commerce

### Small Business Growth

South Carolina continues to place an emphasis on growing small businesses – the backbone of our state’s economy. Small businesses employ more than half of our state’s workers, and 97 percent of all businesses in the state are classified as small businesses. Because our administration believes that small businesses are the driving force behind South Carolina’s economy, we successfully pushed for a reduction of the business tax rate from 7 percent to 5 percent in 2005. This tax cut increased the incentive for entrepreneurs to expand their business. By increasing the return on productive activities, the tax cut created opportunities for small businesses in the state to grow – generating new investment and more jobs. We believe that this pro-business reform will continue to foster small business growth in South Carolina in the future.

### Export Growth

South Carolina has seen significant growth in its export markets during this administration. Between 2003 and 2009, exports rose 40 percent, despite a global slowdown over the last few years. Despite the decline in exports over the last year due to the global recession, South Carolina ranked 23<sup>rd</sup> nationally in exports among the 54 U.S. states and territories.

As the state’s exports grow, so do our opportunities. About nine percent of South Carolina’s total private sector manufacturing employment is supported by exports. In 2009, South Carolina exported goods to 193 countries, including traditional trading partners like Canada and the United Kingdom and quickly growing or emerging markets in China and Vietnam. Last year, South Carolina’s number-one export market was Germany, which purchased more than \$3.4 billion of our products. Making export-business growth a priority will help diversify South Carolina’s presence in the global marketplace.

### Incentive Reform

Throughout our administration, we have expressed concerns that our tax code carves out far too many incentives for only one geographic area of the state or for only one business or industry that may come to our state. According to the Department of Commerce’s 2007 report on our incentive system, “some of the current incentives contained within the tax code have become obsolete or have been amended to the point that they no longer serve their original purposes.” That is why our administration was pleased with the passage of the Economic Development Competitiveness Act in 2010. Among other provisions, the Act removed some of the legislative carve-outs so that all counties are on equal footing because tax credits will be based solely on economic criteria. Additionally, the bill repealed archaic Economic Impact Zone provisions of the state tax code, further ensuring equal treatment for tax incentives for businesses. These were positive steps to guarantee that our approach to economic development is holistic rather than Balkanized.

We continue to believe that incentives can be a positive tool for the state to use when closing an economic development deal. However, the state should continue to move away from a business climate that only rewards new, big business, while old or small businesses receive no benefits – particularly when the incentives fund the competition of existing businesses. This was the reason our administration has successfully fought against granting incentives for retail businesses.

### Employment Security Commission Reform

In the face of an extraordinary recession, there was real progress made in 2010. In March 2010, our administration signed much needed Employment Security Commission (ESC) reform that merged ESC with the workforce division at the Department of Commerce to create a new cabinet-level agency now known as the Department of Employment and Workforce (DEW).

Prior to the reform legislation, ESC was floundering – serving mainly as a check-writing agency without much coordination with potential employers. On December 31, 2001, ESC's unemployment trust fund had a reserve balance of \$627.2 million. On December 31, 2009, the same fund had a balance of \$9.96 million, which included loans from the federal government of \$692 million. That means there was a total loss of nearly \$1.3 billion over that eight year time span. In 2010, prior to the passage of the reform legislation, nearly \$200 million was borrowed from the federal government. It was clear, therefore, that some action was needed.

With the creation of DEW, and the appointment of General John Finan as Executive Director of the newly created agency, necessary changes are underway. Since the agency's creation the state has not needed any further loans from the federal government. Coordinating unemployment insurance with job prospects is agency's core mission. Following the creation of DEW, the General Assembly passed separate legislation that changed the tax structure for unemployment insurance. Employers who use the system less frequently now pay a relatively lower amount in unemployment insurance taxes. This serves as a disincentive for employers to layoff workers. Additionally, the legislation increases the employer's taxable wage base from \$10,000 this year to \$14,000 in 2015 – making the tax structure more progressive.

Finally, in August 2010, the DEW launched its virtual one-stop program. The purpose of the new website is to achieve DEW's core mission – connecting unemployed workers with employers seeking to fill positions. The website, [sconestop.org](http://sconestop.org), is a job search engine that lists all jobs in South Carolina, provides help with creating resumes, providing real-time labor market data, all while being extremely user-friendly. As of December 2010, more than 40,500 jobs were posted on the virtual one-stop website – about 37,000 more job postings than CareerBuilder, 40,000 more than Monster, and 41,000 more than Hotjobs. All told, since April 1, 2010, DEW has placed more than 32,000 people directly into positions.

These are but a few positive changes that have come since the reform legislation created DEW and placed the agency in the cabinet of the executive branch.

### ***Opportunities for Improvement***

#### Improving Economic Soil Conditions

This administration has mentioned numerous times that to increase South Carolina's global competitiveness, we must level the playing field as much as possible. Unfortunately, rural South Carolina still lags behind in access to high-speed internet connections. While the United States as a whole has over 75 million total broadband subscribers, the United States is ranked 24<sup>th</sup> globally in broadband availability – behind South Korea and a majority of the European Union. A study by the Freedom Works Foundation shows that widespread broadband deployment would add nearly

13,000 jobs to South Carolina and increase the Gross State Product by \$4.55 billion. For South Carolina to be truly competitive, all of its citizens must have access to affordable high-speed internet. In the fall of 2009, our administration designated a nonprofit company named Connected Nation to perform mapping services to guide our long-range planning efforts and show us precisely what parts of South Carolina still lack access to broadband internet. After completing the mapping stage, Connected Nation found that about 95 percent has access to fixed broadband according to the recent, excluding mobile broadband. This means that approximately 80,000 households, or five percent, in South Carolina do not have access to fixed broadband. When mobile broadband is included, 99.5 percent of South Carolina has access to broadband internet. We look forward to watching our state continue to grow and develop as a result of this initiative.

While we have improved some economic soil conditions, South Carolinians are still burdened by the third highest effective income tax rate in the Southeast – behind only North Carolina. As a result, South Carolina is in danger of falling behind in global competition for jobs and capital investment. In the Emphasize Economic Development section of this budget, we propose offering an optional flat tax. The tax will not only simplify the current tax code, which includes confusing paperwork for exemptions and deductions, but will also attract economic and human capital to our state. According to a recent study from the Atlanta Federal Reserve Board, “Relative marginal tax rates have a statistically significant negative relationship with relative state growth.” Simply stated, lower tax rates result in higher economic growth.

Additionally, small businesses are still burdened by high costs associated with inflated awards in the workers’ compensation system. We have made progress by enacting comprehensive workers’ compensation reform in 2007, but the business community still needs the protection of objective standards for determining awards.

Finally, we remain committed to reducing the burden that frivolous lawsuits have on businesses in South Carolina. Although the tort reform legislation enacted in 2005 has helped reduce business costs associated with litigation, much remains to be done. In the *2010 State Liability Systems Ranking Study* conducted for the U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform, South Carolina ranked 39th among states in the fairness of its legal climate. For South Carolina to remain competitive in a global economy, we need to continue reducing these unnecessary costs incurred by businesses. Last session tort reform legislation was proposed by Speaker of the House Bobby Harrell and Senator Larry Martin. If enacted, the legislation would:

- Allow the non-use of seatbelts to be admissible in civil cases to reduce damages if injury was caused by failure to wear a seatbelt;
- Caps punitive damages at the greater of two times compensatory damages or \$250,000;
- Caps punitive damages at the lesser of two times compensatory damages or \$250,000 for small businesses;
- Establishes guidelines for pain and suffering awards and caps at \$350,000;
- Limits appeal bond amount to \$25 million (or \$1 million for small businesses).



We hope the next administration will work with the General Assembly to enact meaningful tort reform in order to help turn around South Carolina's economy.

### **Purchasing Priorities**

Our five major funding priorities are those that will best achieve our goal of improving the conditions for economic growth, those are:

Provide for the growth and sustainability of all communities. We continue to approach economic and competitive challenges in South Carolina on a holistic level rather than a piecemeal level. In doing so, we increase the potential for all South Carolinians to benefit from this administration's economic development efforts. Allowing consistent and continued success throughout South Carolina remains a vital step towards global competitiveness. By effectively spreading economic development opportunities across the state and working to improve business soil conditions statewide, we stand a far better chance of growing our economy overall than by focusing on certain areas of the state as priority.

Provide for more effective and broad-based incentive and grant programs. The Department of Commerce has done a good job providing South Carolina with important information on how best to compete by providing the best mix of incentives and grants for our state's economic development efforts. By leveling the playing field for business and not favoring one specific business or industry over another, we give South Carolina the benefit of attracting capital investment and jobs in a business climate that is uniform.


Provide a more unified and focused effort in marketing our state's assets. South Carolina will maintain its reputation as a business-friendly environment by continuing to promote its strengths while working to minimize or eliminate its weaknesses. Marketing dollars spent on promoting the positive aspects to living and working in the Palmetto State provide tangible benefits - every dollar properly invested in marketing returns more than \$20 in direct tourism spending to the economy. A continued emphasis on the look and feel of South Carolina as a superior tourist destination and a business-friendly state will serve the dual purposes of bringing in tourism and capital investment projects - both of which create jobs for South Carolinians.

Provide resources and infrastructure for a more skilled and prepared workforce. South Carolina is consistently recognized for its ability to prepare its workforce for the highly-skilled jobs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Through the Center for Accelerated Technology Training and its programs which are designed to work with businesses on providing labor infrastructure needs, South Carolina continues to provide top level training for the jobs created from emerging technologies in a global economy. To continue our economic development efforts in workforce development, we remain focused on streamlining the allocation of workforce development dollars through the Department of Commerce's Workforce Development Division is necessary.



## Governor's Purchasing Plan – Highlights

As we address our state's unprecedented financial problems, it is important to focus on purchasing only those services that deliver the greatest impact on improving the conditions for economic growth. In many cases, we have used cost savings methods simply to *maintain* current funding levels for high priority services. We do not purchase services that, although valuable, have been identified as lower priorities. The following table identifies key purchases within our executive budget's total state economic development spending plan, as well as examples of what is not purchased. Detailed highlights of our purchasing plan are provided below the table.



### **Our Plan Buys:**

**Continuation of a Comprehensive Marketing Program at the Department of Commerce.** The Department of Commerce continues to impact the global business community through its presence at trade shows and industry-specific events, while also gaining attention through enhanced marketing and public relations efforts within South Carolina and around the world. It is crucial to make the global business community aware of our state's positive business environment. Therefore, we propose maintaining **recurring funding of \$500,000** to the Department of Commerce for their marketing efforts of South Carolina.

**Recurring funding for the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism's Media Placement budget.** The tourism industry will always be a major economic driver in the Palmetto State. In 2003, tourism was a \$14.7 billion a year industry in South Carolina. By 2010, tourism was a \$18.4 billion dollar industry – a 25 percent increase during this administration. The idea of continuing to promote South Carolina's tourism industry to the world has enormous return on

investment potential. PRT's "Product Development" and "Destination Specific" programs focus on enhancing the areas of our state's tourism industry that have the greatest potential to generate new streams of revenue. We recommend the continued allocation of funding to not only foster the growth of these new programs, but also to aid South Carolina's efforts to attract tourists from all over the world. We propose recurring funding of **\$8,250,950** for the agency's media placement budget.

**Funding for the Center for Accelerated Technology Training.** Supplying a well-trained and adaptable workforce is another important element of South Carolina's ability to compete for business opportunities. South Carolina's Center for Accelerated Technology Training program, which is coordinated through our technical college system and the Department of Commerce, is one of the major reasons companies choose South Carolina for their capital investment projects. Because of the success of this program, we propose **increased funding of \$5,300,000** for this workforce training program.

**Local Workforce Investment.** This initiative helps meet the employment, training, and labor market needs of businesses, job seekers, and at-risk youth. These federal dollars are spent in coordination with the state's economic development activities to help recruit high-paying jobs. The training programs are in industries and individual companies targeted by the Department of Employment and Workforce. **Projected FY 2011-12 federal funding is \$89,632,000.**

### **Our Plan Saves By:**

**Transferring the Local Government Infrastructure Grants at the Budget and Control Board to the Department of Commerce.** As the lead agency on economic development for the state, the Department of Commerce should be the agency in charge of all funds directed at growing our urban and rural economies. We have long advocated that having only one agency appropriating economic development funds is more efficient and effective than multiple agencies doing so. Since taking office, this administration in cooperation with the Department of Commerce has had unmatched success in encouraging growth in the state's rural communities. As an example of this success, in the past three years, more than 29 percent of jobs recruited to South Carolina went to rural communities. Further, in its efforts to continue improving workforce readiness in rural South Carolina, the Rural Infrastructure Fund (RIF) helped create Northeastern Technical College Information Technology Laboratory classroom at its Dillon County Community Campus. We believe that we can make this program more successful by moving this program and all associated grant funds to the Department of Commerce. This move would generate **general fund savings of \$133,472** by eliminating duplicative administrative costs.

**Changing the petroleum inspection and testing program.** The Department of Agriculture is charged with inspecting and testing gas pumps for accuracy and suitability for service. The MAP Commission recommended that the Department of Agriculture test a representative sample of fuel dispensers and weighing devices, rather than all of them. Additionally, the current state law provides that, "For the purposes of providing funds for inspecting, testing and analyzing petroleum products and for general state purposes, there must be paid to the department a charge of one-fourth cent a gallon..." Currently, the department runs this program with general fund dollars, contrary to state law. We propose directing the state amount of funds from the gas tax to run this program and

permitting the Department to check a representative sample of fuel dispensers and weights. This will allow the agency to hire the needed inspectors to ensure this program is managed well. This will generate **general fund savings of \$223,047.**

**Making Tough Choices:**

Given the state's finite amount of resources, we had to make some difficult choices regarding which activities to fund this year. While the activities listed below may well have merit, we did not think their anticipated outcome would be as effective as other activities in achieving our goals. The following reflects these difficult choices:

**Reducing pass through funding.** This administration has always believed that any public-private endeavor should be open and objective, rather than obscured by complicated funding practices. An example of this type of funding is the Regional Promotions pass through at the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism – a pass through which the agency recommended should no longer be funded. We believe that funding appropriated for an agency should be directed to accountable, core functions within the agency – and not to providing a limited amount of funding to the 11 regional tourism districts throughout the state. We continue to advocate for a better funding mechanism for these projects than pass through funding. **General fund savings of \$1,375,000.**

**Public Service Activities reaching outside of their core mission of agriculture.** Our administration continues to recognize the valuable role that Clemson's and South Carolina State's PSAs play in our rural areas. However, we think that the agencies should narrow their focus to more closely concentrate on the core mission of serving our state's agricultural community. Such non-core activities include Clemson's Rural Community Leadership Development program and South Carolina State's Community Leadership and Economic Development program. Not only are the programs outside Clemson's and South Carolina State's core missions, but they are duplicative of services provided through the Department of Commerce and the State Housing Finance and Development Authority. These activities represent a **general fund savings of \$2,864,974.**

*Please see the Appendices for a complete listing of the Governor's Purchase Plan for this goal area and for a detailed listing of what our plan saves and what our plan does not buy.*

Improve the Health and  
Protections of Our Children and  
Adults

## Improve the Health and Protections of Our Children and Adults

In South Carolina, nearly one out of every four state tax dollars is directed toward health care. Unfortunately, that significant investment has not led to satisfactory health outcomes in our state. To help South Carolinians get the most out of their health care dollar, we brought the benefit of market-based principles to our health care system. South Carolinians deserve a health system that encourages cost-effective preventative care that offers a wide range of health care options.

Another key ingredient of an individual's high quality of life is the ability to live in a safe and stable environment. South Carolina has programs to reduce child poverty, find permanent homes for foster children, decrease the rate of child abuse and neglect, improve the living conditions of our seniors and those with disabilities, and improve rates of self-sufficiency among our low-income citizens.

Nonetheless, our efforts to improve South Carolina's overall quality of life will be compromised if South Carolinians do not get the efficient and accountable service delivery system that we have called for the past eight years. If South Carolina's government were to be recreated today, then it is inconceivable that anyone would recommend our current health care delivery structure. It is time to implement the kind of effective, efficient, and accountable government structure South Carolina taxpayers deserve.

### Administration's Goals for Improving the Health and Protections of Our Children and Adults:

- ✓ Increase the number of citizens leading healthy lives.
- ✓ Increase access to health care.
- ✓ Increase self-sufficiency.
- ✓ Increase the number of children living in a safe and stable living environment.
- ✓ Reduce preventable injury, illness and death.
- ✓ Reduce health disparities.
- ✓ Reduce poverty.

### Developing Our Purchasing Priorities

During this process, we looked at the major indicators of success to determine whether state government is currently meeting its goal of improving the conditions for the health of our citizens. We have found some modest progress, but there are many areas that need improvement. This section identifies the measures that help explain our state's level of progress in achieving our goal for a healthy citizenry.

#### *Where We Are Succeeding*

Reducing preventable injury, illness, or death through screening. One area where we have been successful in screening is in the rate of women receiving mammograms, which help detect breast cancer in its early stages. Although the overall number of women who get mammograms is


increasing, many women – particularly those who are uninsured, older, or members of certain racial and ethnic minority groups – do not get mammograms at the same rate. Thus, we lowered the “Best Chance Network” eligibility age from 47 to 40 to ensure more women receive the proper testing.

Living in a safe, stable environment. As stated earlier, since the beginning of our administration, the amount of time it takes for a child to be adopted is at one of its lowest levels in eight years. In FY 2009-10, 20 percent of the Department of Social Services’ foster children were adopted within 24 months, and a total of 532 children were adopted. Since FY 2003-04, we have experienced a 58 percent increase in the number of adoptions finalized.

In addition, the average number of months a child spends in foster care continues to decrease. For the children that were reunited with a parent or caretaker during FY 2009-10, almost 75 percent were reunited within 12 months of being removed from their former environment. In the last four years, the average amount of months spent in foster care decreased from 18.6 to 17 months.


Self-sufficiency rates. Increasing rates of independence and self-sufficiency are direct indicators of economic well-being. Key measures of these indicators include the percentage of South Carolinians leaving state assistance (i.e., Temporary Assistance for Needy Families-TANF), the number of seniors and disabled persons able to remain in their own homes, and the unemployment rate. Currently, 80 percent of elder-care is provided by an individual’s family.

Additionally, we have seen community care surpass nursing home care since 2007. By receiving at-home community care, seniors and disabled persons are not only happier, but they help save taxpayer dollars.



Source: South Carolina Department of Health and Human Services


Success should not be measured simply by the number of South Carolinians receiving assistance, but also in the number of those who are able to leave the welfare system. The number of South Carolinians who obtain employment, leave the state assistance program, and remain off assistance for at least one year averaged 89 percent during our administration.



Source: South Carolina Department of Social Services

Additionally, all this was accomplished while the average caseload per Department of Social Services eligibility worker and case manager increased. Eligibility workers determine if applicants are eligible for services, as well as open, adjust and close cases when warranted. The average caseload for eligibility workers is 266 – the optimum caseload is less than half that at 120 cases. The average caseload for case managers, the ones responsible for client assessments and developing employability plans, is 86 cases per manager. The optimum caseload for these workers is also less than half that amount at 40 cases.

The purpose of child support is to ensure that the custodial parent and non-custodial parent share the financial responsibility of raising a child or children. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, approximately 25 percent of custodial parents who are not receiving the child support to which they are entitled live below the poverty line. More than \$100 billion is owed to custodial parents nationwide. In federal fiscal year 2008-09, our state child support distributed collections were \$255 million.



Source: South Carolina Department of Social Services

### *Opportunities for Improvement*

The management structure of our state's health and human services system includes eight different agencies, only three of which answer directly to the Governor. The other five agencies answer to a series of part-time boards. This structure diffuses accountability and sets the executive branch up to look more like a patchwork of competing special interest fiefdoms rather than a united team looking out for the good of the state.

When the MAP Commission first called for health agency restructuring in 2003, more than 20 other states were also considering, planning or executing health agency restructuring initiatives. Today, several of those states, including Alaska, Maine, Texas and Nebraska, have completed those restructuring plans, while South Carolina remains at the starting gate.

While South Carolina has succeeded in some areas, there is great room for improvement in addressing our health care needs. While health outcomes are generally poor across the South, South Carolinians generally rank worse (46<sup>th</sup> nationally in overall health) than our neighbors in North Carolina and Georgia, who rank 37<sup>th</sup> and 43<sup>rd</sup> respectively. This is despite the fact that we outrank both states in per capita public health spending. As seen in the "Public Health Funding" chart, we are clearly not getting enough value for our health care dollars.

2009 Public Health Funding		
State	Rank	Dollars per Person
SC	46	\$81
GA	43	\$69
NC	37	\$50

Source: United Health Foundation

Increase the number of citizens leading healthy lives. Too many South Carolinians make unhealthy lifestyle choices and contribute to the state's overall poor health. The Health Risk Factors Rankings table below indicates that we engage in behavior that puts children and adults at risk.



This table shows that we have the 15<sup>th</sup> highest smoking rate in the nation (22 percent) and the 11<sup>th</sup> highest rate of adults who do not engage in physical activity (47 percent). We rank 45<sup>th</sup> with regard to the number of women receiving prenatal care and 44<sup>th</sup> in the prevalence of obesity.

Health Risk Factors Rankings (SC, NC, GA)			
Indicator	Ranking Among 50 States + DC (lower number indicates better health status)		
	SC	NC	GA
First trimester prenatal care	45	23	27
Smoking rate (per CDC)	35	41	18
Smokers who attempted to stop smoking	37	19	22
Obesity	44	41	43
No leisure time/physical activity	40	34	42
Sources: National Women's Law Center (2007) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC/2009)			

These risk factors contribute to the poor health outcomes summarized in the following table, Health Outcomes Rankings. South Carolina's outcomes indicate poor health across our citizens' lifetimes.

Health Outcomes Rankings (SC, NC, GA)			
Indicator	Ranking Among 50 States + DC (lower number indicates better health status)		
	SC	NC	GA
Percent of pre-term births	46	37	17
Infant death rate	46	44	43
Child death rate	35	25	29
Cancer death rate	38	33	24
Prevalence of diabetes in adults	42	38	44
Stroke death rate	50	45	44
Adult obesity rate	42	32	39
Adults with no mental health days/previous month	32	2	13
Heart disease	33	28	39
Source: Kaiser Family Foundation, 2007			

Access to care. About 50 million Americans, more than 15 percent of the population, do not have health insurance. Overall, the uninsured rate in South Carolina (16.1 percent) sits above the national average of 15.4 percent. Individuals without health insurance frequently do not participate in preventive care programs and can add substantially to the cost of health care due to delayed care and emergency department treatment.

<b>Lack of Health Insurance (Overall State Population)</b>	
<b>State</b>	<b>Percent Uninsured</b>
Alabama	12.0
Virginia	13.8
<b>U.S. Average</b>	<b>15.4</b>
North Carolina	16.0
<b>South Carolina</b>	<b>16.1</b>
Georgia	17.8
Mississippi	18.4
Florida	20.2
Source: United Health Foundation, 2009	

Increase the number of children living in a safe and stable environment. According to national standards, more than 9.9 percent of children who have been returned home after a foster care experience will reenter foster care within 12 months because of unsuitable home conditions. In South Carolina (FY 2009-10), the percentage of children who re-entered care was 7.6 percent, which is slightly better than the national standard.

We are struggling with the stability of foster care placements. The national standard for stability is that of all the children who have been in foster care less than 12 months, 86.7 percent have two or less placement settings. As of July 2010, South Carolina was at 74.8 percent, still short of the national standard. There has been some progress in this area, however, as the overall length of time children spend in foster care has decreased by almost 8.6 percent since FY 2005-06 (from 18.6 months to 17 months).

Reduce preventable injury, illness, and death. Immunization against diseases is a cost effective strategy for improving the health of our citizens. South Carolina is currently 14<sup>th</sup> in the nation with 79 percent of South Carolina's children ages 19-35 months being immunized in 2008, which is slightly higher than the national average of 78 percent.

Occupational Fatalities represents the impact of hazardous jobs on the population. South Carolina is one of 26 states and territories administering its own occupational safety and health program through an agreement with the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). The state Occupational Safety and Health Act requires employers to provide employees with a safe and healthy worksite. To help achieve the objective, the South Carolina OSHA office conducts inspections of businesses to assure compliance with the law with a staff of 17 safety inspectors and 12 industrial hygienists. Tragically, in 2008, our state had 4.5 occupational fatalities (per 100,000 workers). This translates to 87 citizens who lost their lives during a work related incident. In 2009, the number of fatalities decreased by 16 percent (73 fatalities).

Among children, accidents are the number one cause of death in South Carolina. According to the National Safety Council, approximately 45 percent of unintentional injury deaths occurred in and around the home. Unintentional home injury deaths to children are caused primarily by fire and burns, suffocation, drowning, firearms, falls, choking, and poisoning.

Increased awareness of and compliance with safety laws, appropriate vaccinations for major diseases and increased emphasis on curbing domestic violence are all potential ways to improve South Carolina's performance in these areas.

Decrease health disparities. Racial disparities in health outcomes continue to be a significant problem in South Carolina. The National Institute of Health has defined health disparities as, "differences in the incidence, prevalence, mortality and burden of diseases and other adverse health conditions that exist among specific population groups in the United States."

The conditions that disproportionately affect minorities living in South Carolina include cancer, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, kidney disease, HIV/AIDS, lack of immunizations, and infant mortality. Large health disparities exist in our state in areas such as prenatal care, certain cancers, obesity, diabetes, stroke, and heart disease. While the state has made some progress in increasing awareness of preventive health strategies among African-Americans, much more needs to be done to reduce health disparities.

To support this effort, a recent five-year \$6.7 million grant to the University of South Carolina's Arnold School of Public Health from the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities of the National Institutes of Health has been announced to support an established research program in health disparities. Specifically, USC plans to expand research on cancer and other health disparities and strengthen their partnership with Claflin University to educate the next generation of public-health professionals, educators and scientists.

Reduce poverty. Poverty rates directly indicate the economic well-being of children and adults, and are closely linked to physical well-being. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the percentage of children younger than 18 years old in poverty (below 100 percent of federal poverty level) increased from 15.6 percent in 2006 to 20.7 percent in 2009. In South Carolina, the percentage of children younger than 18 years old in poverty is lower than the national average at 17.6 percent. However, the percentage of South Carolina seniors at the federal poverty line is higher (9.8 percent) than the national average of 8.9 percent.

2009 Poverty Rates (Below 100% FPL)	National Average	South Carolina Average
Children younger than 18	20.7%	17.6%
Adults older than 65	8.9%	9.8%

U.S. Census Bureau, 2009

### Purchasing Priorities

We developed this purchasing plan by taking proven and promising strategies and then prioritizing them in a way that will achieve the best results. The key strategies we identified are as follows:

## IMPROVE THE HEALTH AND PROTECTIONS OF OUR CHILDREN AND ADULTS

Provide incentives to promote healthy lifestyles. Improved quality and length of life among South Carolinians begins with citizens making better choices about their own health. Engaging in unhealthy habits such as poor eating, leading a sedentary life, and smoking cigarettes result in significant health care costs to our state. For example, the prevalence of adult obesity in South Carolina costs \$1 billion in medical expenditures, with about half of the costs being funded by Medicare and Medicaid. Obesity-related expenditures represent more than five percent of South Carolina's annual health care bill. Smoking-related health care costs exceed \$1 billion annually.

Provide increased access to insurance and private payment for health care. Many South Carolinians are either uninsured or underinsured. Health insurance coverage increases the likelihood that people will receive the preventive care they need to stay healthy. The increasing number of uninsured individuals will place a large burden on our emergency care systems. Every day in rural South Carolina, more than 100 people receive medical services for which they cannot pay. It has been estimated that the national cost to provide emergency medical services to uninsured is \$130 billion annually. The cost to South Carolina is \$2.7 billion annually.

Provide measures to increase the number of individuals with an identified primary care physician or medical home. People with a regular provider of health care are more likely than those without a usual source of care to receive a variety of preventive health care services. In 2009, an estimated 15 percent of adults in the United States lack a usual source of care and nearly 30 percent of young adults (18-24). In South Carolina, two in five residents have inadequate access to a doctor's office, clinic, or health center.

Provide disease prevention and disease management. Many of the health care and societal costs associated with physical and behavioral disorders can be reduced through improved disease management and prevention programs. Health outcomes in South Carolina clearly demonstrate that we fall short in preventing and managing disease. Cardiovascular disease, cancer, and diabetes are among the leading causes of death. The financial cost of diabetes, in 2008, is \$218 billion a year in the U.S. In South Carolina, the total cost of diabetes was \$2.6 billion in 2006. Indirect costs include increased factors such as absenteeism, reduced productivity, and lost productive capacity due to early mortality. Approximately \$1 of \$5 health care dollars in the United States is spent caring for someone with diagnosed diabetes, while approximately \$1 of \$10 health care dollars is attributed to diabetes. Some of these costs could be reduced through improved blood sugar control, control of elevated blood pressure and high cholesterol, and other disease management techniques.

Provide adequate food and nutrition. A 2008 U.S. Department of Agriculture report reveals that more than 49 million Americans, including 16.7 million children, are "food insecure" which refers to the "ability of people to obtain sufficient food for their household." Additionally, South Carolina is listed as one of six southern states with high "food insecurity rates." Undernutrition can have lasting negative effects upon the physical and cognitive development of children. The Food Stamp Program is the first line of defense in ensuring that low-income families receive adequate nutrition. Programs like the Summer Food Program, Child and Adult Care Food Program, and the Emergency Food Assistance Program help families provide nutritional meals. Providing adequate food and nutrition through programs like Meals on Wheels supports independent living for home-bound adults.

Provide opportunities for employment and independence. To improve the economic well-being and self-sufficiency of our low-income population and our adults with disabilities, we must find ways to continue to increase opportunities for employment. For adults and seniors, adequate supports such as homemakers, personal care aides, Meals on Wheels, and transportation can prevent or delay nursing home institutionalization. Maximizing living choices for adults and seniors, especially if they choose to stay in their own homes or be cared for by family members, is a win-win cost saving strategy for state government and for South Carolina citizens.


Provide child support collections. To reduce the rate of poverty of South Carolina's children, we must find ways to increase child support collections. According to the 2009 United States Department of Agriculture's report on Expenditures on Children for Families, a single parent home with a household income of \$56,000 will spend close to an estimated \$150,000 on one child up to the age of 17. The year before high school graduation, that child costs about \$11,250. Child support collection is important because children in poverty are more likely to suffer poor health, die in childhood, be developmentally delayed, repeat a grade, drop out of high school, become pregnant during adolescence, and be unemployed after high school.

Provide measures to reduce time for foster children to be adopted. By reducing the amount of time for South Carolina children to be adopted, we can increase the number of children in stable and safe environments and reduce the number of children in institutional settings. Another long-term consequence of children aging-out of the foster care system with no permanent family is the high incidence of homelessness experienced by former foster youth. Across the nation, various studies indicate that as many as 27 percent of homeless persons have a history of being in foster care, a group home, or other institutional setting for part of their childhood.

Provide timely and effective interventions when safety is compromised in the home or family environment. Children who are abused and neglected are 25 percent more likely to experience delinquency, teen pregnancy, low academic achievement, drug use, and mental health problems. To reduce costs to society in the long term, children need to be protected from the effects of abuse and neglect. Psychological problems often manifest as high-risk behaviors, which in turn can lead to long-term health problems such as sexually transmitted diseases, cancer, and obesity. For adults and seniors, timely and effective intervention will help prevent recurring abuse and improve the quality of care for residents in long-term care facilities.

## **Governor's Purchasing Plan – Highlights**

As we address our state's unprecedented financial problems, it is important to focus on purchasing only those services that deliver the greatest impact on improving the health and protections of our children and adults. In many cases, we have had to use cost savings methods to simply maintain current funding levels for high priority services. We do not purchase services that, while still considered valuable, have been identified as lower priority. The following table identifies key purchases within our executive budget's total state health care and social services spending plan as well as examples of what is not purchased. Detailed highlights of our purchasing plan are provided below the table.



### **Our Plan Buys:**

#### ***Increased emphasis on disease prevention and promotion of healthy lifestyles***

Immunizations for polio, measles, and other contagious diseases. Many serious childhood diseases are preventable through routine childhood vaccination. Diseases such as polio, whooping cough, and measles are easily spread through communities. Individuals who are not immunized increase the risk that they and others in their communities will contract a contagious disease. Also, the flu and pneumonia are among the leading causes of death in the senior population, and both are easily preventable through either an annual flu shot or a one-time pneumonia vaccine. To prevent disease,

disability, and death from preventable diseases and to avoid the exorbitant public health costs associated with these illnesses, we continue to **support recurring funding for these activities amounting to \$2,065,015 in general funds.**

Funding for maternal and infant health. This funding seeks to improve the health and well-being of children in the state with an emphasis on eliminating health disparities. Activities include family support services, newborn screening and home visits, medical home partnerships, family planning, and nutrition education. These activities also further our goals of promoting healthy behaviors and improving access to comprehensive quality health care. We continue to **support current funding for this activity amounting to \$2,336,351 in general funds.**

*Access to insurance and private payment for health care*

Further emphasis on verifying eligibility (including citizenship) for Medicaid benefits. To be faithful stewards of the taxpayers' dollars, we are working on making sure that Medicaid recipients are actually eligible for those benefits. To fund citizenship verification requirements and other related items mandated by the Federal Deficit Reduction Act, we propose to **fund this activity, amounting to \$8,879,210 in general funds.**

Options for Medicaid coverage for enrolled beneficiaries in South Carolina. The state reimburses the Managed Care Organizations a capitated reimbursement rate for enrolled members. These organizations generally provide a coordinated system of primary care aimed at establishing beneficiaries in a "medical home." Additionally, they provide other health services such as health education and home visits. For this service, we propose to **fund this activity with \$442,396,426 in total funds.**

*Disease prevention and management*

As we maintain funding for prevention-related activities, our state must still deal with the reality that we remain among the unhealthiest populations in the United States – a reality that costs us in terms of both dollars and lives.

Our budget proposes to continue purchasing many activities that manage illness. Because managing illness among the poor and disabled is so important to our state, this budget proposes to fund these activities so that continued health care cost increases can be absorbed without having to reduce services. Important activities include:

Inpatient and outpatient hospital care. Our prevention, pharmacy, medical professional, and clinic services seek to reduce Medicaid recipients' need for hospital care. Nevertheless, some circumstances require a more specialized setting. We propose to **fund Medicaid hospital services with \$132,356,406 in recurring funds and \$41,947,012 in nonrecurring funds – amounting to \$174,303,418 in general funds –** to ensure that our fellow citizens who require this high-level care continue to receive the help they need.



Prescription drug availability for South Carolinians on Medicaid. Pharmaceutical services covered by Medicaid include the provision of most prescription and over-the-counter drugs. Pharmacy utilization levels are growing, but we can save on pharmaceutical costs by pooling our buying power with several other states in the National Medicaid Pooling Initiative. Therefore, we intend to **fund this activity with \$399,492,572 in total funds.**

***Clinical Services for South Carolinians***

Acute Psychiatric Services for consumers whose conditions are temporarily severe enough that they cannot be treated in the community. Services are delivered in a hospital setting with the intention of improving the patient's ability to function and decreasing the number of patients who have to return to a hospital setting for treatment. We propose to **fund this activity amounting to \$6,698,934 in general funds.**

Long-term inpatient psychiatric services for adults whose conditions are of such severity that they are not able to be treated in the community. Services for these individuals are provided by a multidisciplinary team in a hospital setting. We propose to **fund this activity, amounting to \$17,814,944 in general funds.**

Chemical dependency community-based treatment services. The need for mental health and substance abuse treatment is closely linked as many individuals with mental illness abuse alcohol and other drugs. Services for individuals with chemical dependencies range from locally available outpatient treatments to specialized treatments such as detoxification, adolescent inpatient services, and residential services. First, this funding will go toward evidence-based prevention for adolescents to prevent alcohol use and alcohol dependency. Second, it will be used for treatment services within the community to reach individuals early in the dependency cycle to reduce the need for more expensive, episodic treatment in residential facilities and hospital emergency rooms. We propose to **maintain funding for this activity, amounting to \$5,909,668 in general funds.**

***Adequate food and nutrition***

Food stamps and other food programs for South Carolinians. The Food Stamp program is a federal entitlement program. It is administered by the state to provide low-income families and individuals food stamps through the use of debit cards. For those who qualify, the Food Stamp program must provide work-related activities that will lead to employment and decrease dependency. The provision of funding to pay for food helps safeguard the health and well-being of the state's population. We propose to **maintain current funding for this activity amounting to \$14,424,386 in general funds.**

***Opportunities for employment and independence***

Home health services for recipients. Home health services include part-time nursing aide services, therapies (i.e., physical, speech or occupational), and supplies. We propose to **maintain funding for this activity amounting to \$1,962,972 in general funds.**



Child care vouchers for children in families transitioning off of welfare and for other low-income families. The vouchers allow eligible low-income families to become and remain employed with the help of available, affordable, high quality child care. This program protects the children's well-being while their parents work or attend school or training. We propose to **maintain funding for this activity amounting to \$7,159,516 in general funds.**

Vocational Rehabilitation Direct Client Services to persons with disabilities. This activity provides assessment, counseling, placement, academic training, transportation, and retention services to eligible adults with disabilities to prepare for employment. Successfully employed clients become contributing members of the workforce rather than relying on Social Security disability benefits, Medicaid, and other public assistance. The cost of their rehabilitation is repaid through their taxes in an average of 5.5 years. We propose using administrative savings derived from restructuring the Vocational Rehabilitation Department and the Commission for the Blind to **maintain recurring funding for this activity, amounting to \$7,245,293 in general funds.**

Community training homes for vulnerable South Carolina citizens. Community training homes offer the mentally challenged the opportunity to live in a home-like environment under the supervision of trained caregivers. We propose **funding to help reduce the waiting list for the mentally challenged, amounting to \$40,134,697 in general funds.**

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. This program provides assistance to needy families with children and provides parents or caretaker relatives with job preparation, work experience, job placement, and support services to enable them to leave the program and become self-reliant. This activity assisted clients in finding more than 10,000 jobs last fiscal year. We propose **funding for this activity amounting to \$7,031,935 in general funds.**

### *Child support collections*

Child support enforcement for children receiving support from a non-custodial parent. Child Support Enforcement establishes paternity for children born out of wedlock, establishes and enforces orders for child support, and collects and distributes the support. Support collected from non-custodial parents totaled \$255 million in FY 2008-09. In actual performance, for every \$1 spent in child support activities, it returns \$4.83 (fiscal year 2008). We propose recurring **funding for this activity of \$3,891,201 in general funds.**

### *Measures to reduce time for foster children to be adopted*

Foster care services for children who have been abused or neglected, are no longer able to safely stay with their families, and are taken into the custody of the state. Foster care is the temporary placement of a child with a licensed foster family or group home. Foster care workers monitor the children in the foster or group home and arrange needed medical, educational, vocational, social, treatment, and rehabilitative services. Foster care workers also identify needed services for the birth family if reunification is the plan. These services protect the child and provide a temporary home environment. We propose **recurring funding for this activity of \$6,477,419 in general funds.**

Adoption services for children with a plan to find loving and stable families for foster children, which includes recruiting parents, performing or contracting for home studies, placing children with families, and stabilizing placements after the adoption. We propose **recurring funding for this activity of \$2,912,453 in general funds.**

Adoption subsidies for special needs children. This program provides a monthly subsidy to adoptive parents based on the needs of the child up to the amount the child received in care. We propose **funding for this activity of \$11,901,002 in general funds.**

Adoption incentives to families to cover part of the adoption costs. We restored this incentive in 2004 to help further our goal of finding permanent, stable homes for our state's 1,600 foster children with a plan for adoption. We propose to **maintain current funding at \$715,717 for this activity.**

***Timely and effective interventions when safety is compromised***

Child protective services when child abuse or neglect is suspected. CPS workers investigated thousands of reports of child abuse and neglect last year. When abuse is confirmed, treatment services are provided to the family, allowing the child to remain in the home when possible. These services protect the children and prevent them from being removed from their families. We propose **funding for this activity with \$4,408,524 in general funds.**

Adult protective services for vulnerable adults living in a non-institutional setting. This service identifies and corrects conditions of actual or potential abuse, neglect, or exploitation of persons 18 years or older who are disabled or incapacitated. We propose **funding this activity with \$10,956,017 in total funds.**

***Our Plan Saves By:***

**Restructuring our health care agencies.** We continue to support consolidating five health services agencies into two agencies, each more directly accountable to the Governor and to the citizens of South Carolina. We expect that creating an efficient health services delivery system will yield approximately **\$11.6 million in general fund savings in the first fiscal year.** The administrative savings are delineated as follows:

Agency	Savings
Department of Health and Environmental Control	\$4,197,236
Department of Mental Health	\$5,262,488
Department of Disabilities and Special Needs	\$1,938,303
Department of Alcohol & Other Drug Abuse Services	\$208,737
Continuum of Care	\$70,548
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>\$11,677,312</b>

Making our Human Services agency structure more efficient by merging the Vocational Rehabilitation Department and Commission for the Blind. In 2002, the Legislative Audit Council recommended that the General Assembly merge the Commission for the Blind and the Vocational Rehabilitation Department to realize increased efficiency and lower costs. The LAC report found that this could be done without adversely affecting the quality of services provided by either agency. The report further found that:

1. both agencies' core missions are to place clients in competitive employment;
2. more than 50 percent of the commission's budget is spent on competitive job placement;
3. South Carolina is one of only 12 states with a stand-alone commission; and
4. the rehabilitation rate for merged agencies is higher than the combined rates of stand-alone agencies.

We propose merging these two agencies, **saving \$590,663 in the first year, and redirecting those savings to fund direct client services at the new agency.**

### **Making Tough Choices:**

Given the state's finite amount of resources, we had to make some difficult choices regarding which activities to fund. During the last fiscal year, several health-related state agencies reduced administrative costs, eliminated agency staff, and implemented a mandatory furlough for all employees.

**Eliminating the Office on Aging Geriatric Physician Program.** Since this loan forgiveness program began in 2005, only 14 doctors who have agreed to practice geriatrics in South Carolina for at least five years have actually received loan forgiveness. While we believe this is a worthy goal, and recognize that South Carolina is the only state to give this type of incentive, we believe that the geriatric practice in South Carolina would benefit more from the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, which is supported by the American Geriatric Society. This national program recruits health professionals to provide primary health services in areas that lack adequate medical care. In return, the federal government offers loan forgiveness. Because of the availability of federal loan forgiveness, we propose eliminating the Geriatric Physician Program and **saving \$35,000.**

*Please see the Appendices for a complete listing of the Governor's Purchasing Plan for this goal area and for a detailed listing of what our plan saves and what our plan does not buy.*

Improve the Quality of Our  
Natural Resources

## Improve the Quality of Natural Resources

The high quality of South Carolina's natural resources is directly correlated to our citizens' high quality of life. From our pristine beaches to the majestic foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, South Carolina has a lot to offer in the way of natural beauty. To ensure future generations will enjoy an equally high quality of life, we must maintain the balance between economic development and environmental protection.

South Carolina's landscape is likely to change now more than ever as recent estimates suggest the state's population will increase by 12 percent by the year 2030. With such change comes a unique opportunity to shape our state's future – from preserving our natural resources to developing our towns and neighborhoods. Our state's natural beauty – our beaches and marshlands, mountains and rivers – will become increasingly endangered unless we protect our environment and better manage land use. We must always strike a balance between infrastructure needs and environmental protection, between new construction and God's creation. Finding this balance is the key to preserving South Carolina's way of life.

Natural resources provide both an immediate economic benefit and a lasting quality of life to the citizens of South Carolina. For these reasons, our budget priorities focus on activities that deliver positive outcomes and preserve South Carolina for future generations.

### Administration's Goals for Improving the Quality of Our Natural Resources:

- ✓ Managing state resources for public benefit.
- ✓ Minimizing the negative environmental effects of business and population growth, industrialization, and development.
- ✓ Regulating and enforcing quality standards.
- ✓ Producing outcome-driven solutions for citizen stewardship.

### Developing Our Purchasing Priorities

To develop our purchasing priorities, we examined whether state government is currently reaching its goal of improving the quality of South Carolina's natural resources. South Carolina continues to make progress, but the accelerating pace of land development, the flagrant abuse of our environment by litterbugs and arsonists, and public indifference toward recycling and neighborhood conservation threatens the future of South Carolina's natural beauty.

### *Where We Are Succeeding*

One of the state's most successful efforts in preserving our natural resources was the creation of the South Carolina Conservation Bank in 2002. The Bank works with private foundations, land trusts, and other government agencies to conserve natural resources in South Carolina by giving landowners incentives to create conservation easements on their property and by purchasing interests in land from willing sellers. The Bank decides to purchase land based on objective evaluations of the land's natural resource value, financial leverage, and relative benefit to the public.

Since its creation, the Bank has conserved a total of 152,720 acres of forest lands/wetlands, 736 acres of urban parks, 9,615 acres of farm lands, and 490 acres of historical lands. In its four years of funding, the Bank has conserved 163,111 acres of land at an average cost of \$528 per acre – guarding the heritage that makes South Carolina such a special place. The Bank has become the main source of land conservation funding for statewide grants, and has funded conservation projects in 27 counties in South Carolina. Also, the Department of Natural Resources has conserved an additional 95,255 acres of land, while the Forestry Commission has preserved another 15,645 acres over this same time period.

In addition to land conservation, our state is also making progress in the area of energy conservation. In July 2008, the Public Service Commission approved regulations for net metering in South Carolina. Net metering refers to a system that allows homeowners or businesses that generate power, whether by solar fuel cells or wind turbines, to sell any excess energy to the utility provider. In other words, if your home runs on solar fuel cells and you use less power than you generate, you can sell the excess back to the power company. Currently, all power companies in this state (SCE&G, Duke Power, Santee Cooper, and Progress Energy) offer a net metering program. Because net metering is such a practical energy solution, we encourage net metering in South Carolina and hope our citizens will continue to find innovative ways to produce clean, renewable energy.

During this administration, the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism's State Park Service has made great strides in improving the way the state's parks are operated. As a result of five years of improving management, spurred by this administration's steady encouragement, South Carolina's state parks are now generating nearly 80 percent of their own budget. PRT was also able to grow the tourism industry from a \$14.7 billion a year in 2003 to an \$18.4 billion dollar a year industry in 2010 and won 57 national and international awards in the process.

A public-private partnership broke ground on the new Farmers Market in Lexington County in August 2008. The new mark will include exhibition kitchen, a specialty foods shop, a dedicated children's play area, school bus drop off area, RV Park, on-site restaurants and a 400-seat amphitheater – providing an agricultural venue that is second to none. When it opened this past October, the new market began to further the Department of Agriculture's mission of providing new opportunities for our state's farmers and enhancing agricultural commerce in the Palmetto State.

### ***Opportunities for Improvement***

As we move South Carolina forward, it is clear that we need to rethink how we power our state's homes and businesses. Changes in federal policy and environmental regulations indicate that we can no longer rely on coal as our primary energy source, and we need to look at alternatives that are both economical and environmentally friendly. These considerations influenced our decision to oppose Santee Cooper's proposed new coal-fired electricity plant in the Pee Dee region, and we were pleased that Santee Cooper scrapped its plan by working with other utilities to meet our state's energy needs. Rather than relying on coal, South Carolina needs to look to nuclear power as the source for our next generation of electricity plants, and we support Santee Cooper and SCANA's move in this direction.

A multi-agency study by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency gave our state's air quality the highest rating possible. However, our state's level of water pollution is a serious problem that

affects the quality of life of all our citizens, not just those with waterfront property. The Department of Health and Environmental Control, DHEC, environmental oversight is often compromised by its potentially conflicting objectives: weighing health and environmental protection against economic and industrial development. Unfortunately, DHEC's current structure gives the Legislature extensive control over the agency – subjecting DHEC to more politicization than is necessary. This is yet another example – seen all too often in state government – that when everyone is in charge, no one is in charge. We ask the General Assembly to consider restructuring DHEC in ways that make it directly accountable to the governor and focus its efforts to protect our environment.

### **Purchasing Priorities**

Having determined where we are succeeding and where opportunities for improvement exist, it is important to identify the strategies that dictate our spending priorities and will help us achieve our objectives.

Market and enhance the economic and social value of South Carolina's natural resources. Billions of dollars are contributed annually to South Carolina's economy from natural resource-related industries. To achieve our objectives, we must encourage the responsible use of South Carolina's agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, parks, and tourism-related resources. It is essential that we consider long-term economic goals and increase public access to natural resources for recreational and commercial use.

Create statewide policies, incentives, and programs aimed at ecological sustainability. According to the most recent estimates, South Carolina will have 916 square miles of new development by 2030. To put that figure in perspective, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates that Charleston County has a total area of 918.51 square miles. Such rapid development will demand that we pay close attention to land conversion rates, deforestation, and the potentially negative impact of uncontrolled growth. Ecological sustainability demands programs that offer flexible and creative responses to conservation and preservation issues while respecting private property rights. In summary, natural resource conservation requires us to be dedicated to policies and practices that sustain our ecosystem but do not overburden landowners.

Create and enforce quality standards and the responsible use of natural resources. To maintain the high quality of our state's resources, we must create and enforce air and water quality standards through the use of permits, inspections, and other means.


Create and maintain programs aimed at citizen-level stewardship and education. By educating the public, we can significantly reduce the amount of state resources spent to maintain and repair public property. Educational opportunities should provide public information encouraging environmental stewardship, educate youth on South Carolina's natural resources, promote "best practices" in forestry and agriculture, and encourage the responsible use of our natural resources.

Prevent and respond to the irresponsible use of our natural resources. Mankind may very well be classified as "enemy number one" to natural resources. By creating measures that prevent or deter people from violating our state's environmental regulations, we can better preserve our natural resources.



## Governor's Purchasing Plan – Highlights

As we address our state's unprecedented financial problems, it is important to focus on purchasing only those natural resource services most needed by our citizens. In many cases, we have had to use cost savings methods simply to *maintain* current funding levels for high priority services. We do not purchase services that, though valuable, are lower priorities. The following table identifies key purchases within our executive budget's total state natural resources spending plan as well as examples of what is not purchased. Detailed highlights of our purchasing plan are provided below the table.



## Our Plan Buys:

**Marine infrastructure and resources monitoring program support.** This program strengthens South Carolina's marine infrastructure. Marine monitoring provides South Carolina with profitable tourism-related industries while promoting a sustainable ecosystem. We propose maintaining the current funding level of **\$1,604,512** to help preserve South Carolina's aquaculture.

**Enhanced water quality.** South Carolina has 29,794 miles of rivers, 407,505 acres of lakes, and 401 square miles of estuaries that would benefit from a large-scale monitoring network. Water is becoming a coveted resource – as shown by recent disputes with Georgia and North Carolina – and



the monitoring and maintenance of water quality and quantity will only increase in importance. Therefore, we propose maintaining the current funding level of **\$10,953,259** for this program.

**Protecting and conserving land for future generations.** Since it was formed in 2002 the Conservation Bank has saved over 631,000 acres around South Carolina. With projects in 27 counties we feel that, in the interest of the environment and future generations, we propose funding the South Carolina Conservation bank at **\$7,887,460**.

***Our Plan Saves By:***

**Consolidating select DHEC, DNR, and Forestry Commission functions into the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.** Less than 20 percent of DHEC's budget is allocated to environmental activities, and many of the Forestry Commission's responsibilities can be provided by DNR. This proposed consolidation will make our administrative system more efficient – freeing up **\$1.15 million** of general funds.

**Integrating PSA's forestry efforts with Forestry Commission programs.** Clemson PSA provides "best management" forestry programs, but the Forestry Commission already provides similar sustainable forestry programs. We recommend integrating all forestry programs under the Forestry Commission. Integration provides strength and efficiency for the program while conserving **\$1,272,167** of general funds.

**Consolidating our state's food-processing regulatory system.** Although testing and inspecting South Carolina's food-processing operations is important to the health of our state's citizens, we do not need different state agencies to duplicate each other's work. Currently, DHEC, the state Department of Agriculture, and the state Livestock-Poultry Health Commission each take part in administering our state's food inspection laws. Food-processing oversight should be exclusively DHEC's responsibility, thereby saving an estimated **\$474,836** of general funds.

**Reducing the negative impact of animal agriculture on the environment by encouraging privately-funded research and educational programs for animal agriculture producers.** Though it is imperative that we reduce the effects of animal waste on the environment, we think these activities should be funded by private organizations and individuals. By creating a fee-based system, we are able to save **\$211,591** of general funds.

**Eliminating marketing programs currently being performed by the Department of Agriculture.** The Department of Agriculture's "Certified South Carolina Grown" work to provide marketing services for South Carolina's agricultural industry. Because of the current budgetary needs, and because the Department receives separate funding to support the State Farmers Markets, we believe funding these kinds of marketing services are not a wise use of state revenue. Unlike tourism marketing, which brings in money from outside the state, these kinds of agricultural promotions do not provide the kind of economic return necessary to justify funding this year. We recommend eliminating the funding for "Certified South Carolina Grown" because we don't think spending general funds on advertising is the most responsible way to manage the few dollars we have in this difficult budget year. Our proposal saves **\$722,932** of general funds.

**Making Tough Choices:**

Given the state's finite amount of resources, we have to make some difficult choices about the best ways to allocate state funds. While the following activities have merit, we do not think their anticipated outcomes are as effective in achieving our goals as the programs discussed previously.

**Natural Resources and Environmental Research and Education study funding on recreation and tourism from Clemson PSA.** This program is a lower priority than other areas such as education and health care. Also, we believe individuals and private industry can perform this function. This proposal saves **\$1,914,375** of general funds.

**Television, web, print, and radio campaigns.** Our need to fund programs like "Making It Grow" or other media productions is a lower priority than other areas, such as law enforcement or health care. We propose eliminating funding for television, web, print, and radio this year – saving **\$800,545** of general funds.

**Forest renewal program.** Alternative financial assistance is available for private, non-industrial landowners. Critical needs in other budget areas take precedence over the state's contribution of **\$200,000** for this landowner subsidy.

*Please see the Appendices for a complete listing of the Governor's Purchasing Plan for this goal area and for a detailed listing of what our plan saves and what our plan does not buy.*

Improve the Safety of People  
and Property

## Improve the Safety of People and Property

From Day One, our administration has made South Carolina's "quality of life" a priority. South Carolina provides a unique look and feel that most other states and countries cannot provide. We must continually to work not only to maintain, but also improve, our state's quality of life – which is important to companies that are considering where they want to invest resources and create jobs. Additionally, maintaining a high quality of life is important to sustaining the state's tourism industry – the foundation of South Carolina's economy.

Many factors go into determining a high quality of life, including our state's natural beauty, high quality education, and the ease with which citizens live their daily lives. At a fundamental level, however, few factors contribute more than low crime rates and adequate preparation for natural or man-made disasters.

In 2009, South Carolina ranked third in the nation in violent crimes per 100,000 people, according to the most recent Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) report. This is improvement from our first and second in the nation in previous years. South Carolina's decrease of 7.8 percent in violent crimes was 21.7 percent greater than the national average decrease of 6.1 percent. Many factors contribute to South Carolina's struggles in this area including population density, the concentration of youth, economic conditions, the strength of local law enforcement agencies, education levels, and family cohesiveness. However, the lack of consistent and adequate public safety funding has played a disproportionate role in our discouraging crime rates. Nowhere has this lack of support been more evident than at the Department of Corrections and the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services.

In addition to criminal activity, South Carolina is also vulnerable to natural and technological hazards. Not only is our coast vulnerable to hurricanes, but the state has also been heavily impacted by droughts for the past several years. Finally, Charleston's port and the eight nuclear power facilities spread across the state are also vulnerable to terrorist activity.

South Carolina continues to face challenges in the area of highway safety but has also seen progress. South Carolina saw the lowest number of fatalities on the road in over 30 years this year, yet continues to rank third out of all states for deadliest roads.

### Administration's Goals for Improving the Safety of People and Property:

- ✓ Decrease personal injuries and property damage that result from natural and man-made disasters and criminal activities.
- ✓ Increase the percentage of offenders managed successfully.
- ✓ Increase emergency response and recovery following natural and man-made disasters and criminal activities.
- ✓ Increase citizens' confidence in their safety.

Public safety is a primary concern for South Carolinians and, once again, is a priority in our executive budget.

### **Developing Our Purchasing Priorities**

To develop our purchasing priorities, we first established major indicators that will assist us in monitoring the annual progress of improving the safety of people and property in South Carolina. South Carolina is performing well in some areas, but there are many opportunities for improvement.

### ***Where We Are Succeeding***


As our administration comes to an end, we should not only look toward the future, but also recognize some of the accomplishments of the past eight years. Though much work remains, much has been achieved toward our goal of making our state as safe as possible for the citizens of South Carolina. The successes of our administration are due in large part to the hard work and dedication of the folks at law enforcement agencies both at the state and local levels. Though by no means exhaustive, our administration would like to highlight just a small sample of our accomplishments:

- Seven years after our administration first advocated for sentencing reform legislation, the General Assembly passed a comprehensive sentencing reform bill. This legislation, once fully implemented, will lead to more effective methods to reduce recidivism rates, ensure that the criminal justice system is more accountable and help bend the cost curve saving South Carolina over \$400 million.
- South Carolina is one of two states testing ‘call capture’ technology in order to reduce illegal phone calls from our prison system. Corrections believes that the Federal Communications Commission could approve the permanent use of this technology within the next year-and-a-half.
- Helped implement a pilot initiative where the Department of Juvenile Justice, State Law Enforcement Division, the Department of Commerce and local officials partnered together in Colleton County to improve community safety, aid at risk youth and strengthen community soil conditions to encourage economic development.
- Reduced the DJJ population by 59 percent from 431 in 2003 to 175 in 2010, at the Broad River Road Complex, where the states most violent offenders are housed. DJJ also reduced the total number of juveniles at DJJ from 1,600 in 2003 to 1,124 in 2010 – a reduction of 30 percent.
- While reducing expenditures by 50 percent, the Department of Corrections was able to increase GED and Vocational Certificates by over 20 percent with 1,089 inmates earning GEDs and 2,423 inmates earning vocational certificates in 2010.
- Arrested more than 71,000 for DUI between 2003 and 2010, the Department of Public Safety made more than 4.45 million traffic stops.

- The State Law Enforcement Division seized over 2,700 pounds of drugs with a street value of over \$7 million and made over 200 drug trafficking related arrests in 2010 alone.
- Made the DMV a cabinet-level agency and implemented reforms at the agency that reduced the average wait times at DMV offices from 66 minutes to less than 10 minutes.
- Advocated for the successful passage of two bills increasing the penalties for driving under the influence (DUI). The first bill, in 2003, lowered the DUI limit from .1 to .08. The second bill, in 2008, significantly toughened the penalties for repeat offenders and grossly intoxicated offenders, and increased the penalty for refusing to take a breathalyzer test.
- Abolished the antiquated mini-bottle law, which encouraged higher alcohol content (in addition to harming the tourism industry).
- Advanced legislation aimed at reducing the number of domestic violence incidents in South Carolina, including creating a domestic violence task force, instituting mandatory minimum sentences for individuals convicted of domestic violence, and allowing courts to recognize domestic violence convictions in other states when judges are sentencing offenders in South Carolina.

This year, the Department of Public Safety has reported that South Carolina once again decreased the number of alcohol-related highway fatalities. According to an annual National Highway Transportation Safety Administration report, South Carolina showed a decrease in the number of alcohol-related fatalities, dropping from 400 in 2008 to 377 in 2009. 2009 was the fourth year in a row that alcohol-related fatalities have dropped and South Carolina is on track to drop for a fifth straight year. In fact, since this administration has been in office, South Carolina has seen a decrease in alcohol-related fatalities in every year but one – a total decrease of 31 percent from 549 in 2002. While the state remains well above the national average for percentage of highway fatalities involving alcohol, we are making continued progress.

Alcohol Related Driving Fatalities 2000-2009



In 2007, we enacted a law stating that South Carolina would not participate in the implementation of the federal REAL ID Act. Fourteen other states have since joined our state in passing similar laws and 10 additional states have passed resolutions denouncing REAL ID. This unfunded mandate by the federal government would force states to issue licenses in a uniform format and containing uniform information. Implementation of the program would increase DMV workloads by 132 percent and push wait times to over an hour, while costing the taxpayers of South Carolina \$25 million in startup costs and \$11 million on an annual basis.

In March 2008 and in December 2009, the Department of Homeland Security attempted to force every state to comply with REAL ID by threatening to not accept a state's driver's license for identification purposes to enter a federal building or board an airplane unless the license was REAL ID compliant. We successfully resisted this tactic, and our citizens can still use their driver's license as a valid form of identification for federal purposes. This past October, the Department of Motor Vehicles announced the new more secure South Carolina driver's license. In doing this, South Carolina proved that states are capable of creating fully secure driver's licenses without the federal government imposing unfunded mandates. We encourage the General Assembly to continue to resist REAL ID and encourage every state to join South Carolina in opposing this top-down federal mandate.


In 2008, our administration successfully promoted the toughest in the nation illegal immigration reform law that did not include an I-9 loophole, but rather requires employers to use E-Verify to ensure that all hires are in the country legally. At the time, South Carolina was only the third state to

## FY 2011-12 Executive Budget


require employers use E-Verify – a free program run by the Department of Homeland Security – to check the legal status of their employees. An article in the *Arizona Republic* dated October 31, 2010, states, “Only three businesses – all in the Phoenix area – have been prosecuted in the nearly three years since Arizona’s highly publicized employer-sanctions law took effect. During that time, not a single business outside of Maricopa County [where Phoenix is located] has been punished for hiring illegal immigrants. By contrast, South Carolina has cited more than 200 business for being out of compliance” since 2009. South Carolina passed one of the most effective illegal immigration reform laws giving other states a blueprint for a law that punishes business for hiring illegal immigrants and drives illegal immigrants out of states.”

Unfortunately, from FY 1996-97 to FY 2010-11, the major law enforcement and correctional agencies (SLED, SCDC, PPP, DJJ, DMV, DPS, and DNR) saw their budgets – as a percentage of the overall state budget – decline by 13.16 percent.

**FY 1996-97**



**FY 2010-11**




This reduction resulted mainly from a “crowding out” of funds available to the major law enforcement and correctional agencies due to significant growth in the state’s other core areas – primarily health care and education. The result is a decrease in law enforcement agencies’ ability to retain staff and replace older, broken-down equipment. During the past few years as the budgets of agencies charged with protecting the citizens of South Carolina have decreased their productivity has increased. For example, SLED has had 22 percent of its total funds cut since FY 2007-08 but its Fugitive Task Force has seen an 163 percent increase in the number of fugitives arrested from 156 in 2007 to 411 in 2009. From FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11, funding for the Highway Patrol decreased 11 percent but DUI arrests made by troopers increased by 14 percent and South Carolina had the fewest deaths on its roads in over thirty years.

Despite appropriating a smaller portion of the state’s budget, South Carolina continues to make progress in several of the areas relating to public safety: the mileage death rate and the DUI fatality rate. These successes indicate our administration’s continued progress of decreasing preventable



injury and loss, increasing emergency response and recovery, and increasing citizens' confidence in their safety. The state has made additional improvements in forensic casework management, recovering stolen vehicles, and fugitive arrests.



South Carolina is also making incremental gains in terms of managing offenders based on decreases in the state's inmate escape rates. These gains come even though South Carolina has a sizable prisoner incarceration rate of 526 prisoners per 100,000 citizens. The state's prisoner incarceration rate ranked 10<sup>th</sup> in the nation and 9<sup>th</sup> in the Southern region. Due to managerial and policy changes, the state's inmate escape rate at the Department of Corrections has declined 68.7 percent, from 0.16 percent in 2002 to 0.05 percent in 2010.

The combined assault rate at the Department of Corrections – the number of inmate assaults on fellow inmates, inmate assaults on guards, and inmate assaults on other persons – has decreased 23 percent from 4.3 percent in FY 2004-05 to 3.3 percent in FY 2009-10.

The Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) reports that since 2004, only four juveniles have escaped from its Broad River Road Complex – which houses the state's most dangerous juvenile offenders.

Additional offender management success is reflected by DJJ's School District receiving an "excellent" rating for the seventh consecutive year, as well as an "excellent" improvement rating for the sixth time in the last seven years. With these ratings, DJJ received a Palmetto Gold Award for the seventh consecutive year.

Within its school district, DJJ emphasizes academics and basic literacy to increase youth capacity for future productivity. The number of youth earning their GED certificates has improved dramatically since 2003 with over 1,000 diplomas and GEDs awarded. The 147 GEDs earned by DJJ students in

## FY 2011-12 Executive Budget

---

FY 2009-10 represents a 41 percent increase over the 104 GEDs awarded in 2003. The DJJ average for completing the GED is 67 percent, compared to the state average of 62 percent.

DJJ has seen a significant decrease in the number of lawsuits brought against the department by implementing measures to alleviate overcrowding and ensure the safety of juveniles within its facilities – meeting all of the requirements set by the federal court order in 1995. In 2003, DJJ had 31 pending lawsuits brought by inmates in its care, and inmates brought 12 additional lawsuits in FY 2004-05. Currently, there are only three pending lawsuits against the agency.


During the budget downturn of 2008-2009, DJJ had to eliminate funding for its Teen After-School Centers (TASC) in order to maintain core, mandated functions. The centers provide non-violent at risk teens with safe places for recreation, tutoring, and mentoring in order to keep them out of the DJJ system and reduce juvenile delinquency. DJJ opened 24 centers in 2009-2010 and will persist in the long term goal of establishing one in every county. The majority of TASC sites are in churches and nonprofit organizations such as the Boys and Girls Club.

DJJ is also succeeding in preventing juvenile recidivism by offenders serving probation, parole, or completing arbitration programs. DJJ reports that 85 percent of juveniles in community programs did not re-offend while under DJJ supervision. Placing youth in Intensive Supervision is another way DJJ is reducing recidivism. Juveniles that re-enter the community under Intensive Supervision have a 37.5 percent lower rate of re-offending than youth who receive standard supervision.

The South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (DNR) plays a vital role in ensuring citizens are safe as they enjoy the outdoors of our state. In FY 2009-2010, DNR's Law Enforcement Division identified and resolved 2,367 safety violations. DNR's management accountability initiative has greatly improved DNR's ability to effectively protect our state's resources. Field officers have provided over 6,000 man-hours of support to law enforcement agencies that prosecute public safety violations and conduct search-and-rescue operations. Finally, DNR's hunting and boating safety classes, which drew over 18,375 students last year, exhibit DNR's proactive approach to public safety.

The Sate Law Enforcement Division (SLED) has also seen progress in its Forensic Laboratory and the number of DNA profiles it keeps of convicted criminals. During FY 2009-2010, case backlogs were reduced in four of the forensic laboratory units reducing the amount of time evidence takes to be processed. SLED was able to reduce turnaround time in their Drug Analysis and Toxicology lab from more than 90 days to 30 days.

SLED has steadily increased the number of convicted criminal DNA profiles that it maintains from 63,300 in FY 2005-06 to 149,557 in FY 2009-10 – an increase of 132 percent. Due to this increase, over the same period of time, the number of offender hits increased 193 percent from 258 in FY 2005-06 to 757 in FY 2009-10.




Another example of success is the victims' restitution program managed by the Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services (PPP). PPP has steadily increased the total dollar amount of restitution payments collected and disbursed to victims. Last year, PPP collected and disbursed \$6,086,866 to victims. Since 2002, PPP has increased its collections for restitution by 13.9 percent, even while it has seen its state appropriations decline by 20 percent.

### ***Opportunities for Improvement***


South Carolina has some room for improvement but when looking at the big picture there have been some clear accomplishments. For instance, the number of alcohol-related driving fatalities has dropped for four years in a row, its lowest in over 10 years, and is on track to drop a fifth. Nevertheless, our administration realizes that alcohol-related driving fatalities are still a problem in South Carolina. As such, we remain committed to a greater reduction in alcohol-related traffic deaths and have taken steps toward reducing such deaths by promoting tougher DUI laws.

South Carolina's mileage death rate (MDR), defined as the number of traffic fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles of travel, continues to be slightly higher than the national average. However, South Carolina's roads were the safest ever in 2009 with fatalities decreasing by 27 – leaving the state's MDR at 1.85.




Highway officers currently patrol over 66,248 miles of state roadways, enforce traffic laws, investigate collisions, assist motorists, and provide a safe motoring environment for the public. After increasing the number of troopers to 974 in 2008, the Highway Patrol has, once again, seen its numbers decrease due to budget cuts. Maintaining the number of troopers has been a priority in our executive budget to help to continue to combat the state's high drunk driving rate as well as improve the response time to collisions.

### Highway Patrol Commissioned Officer Manpower



Source: SCHP as of 7/16/10


Improvements are also needed in South Carolina's adult recidivism rates, which have steadily risen since 1999 – although there was a decrease from 2006-2007. While the state's recidivism rate of 33.5 percent is close to the southern rate of 34.8 percent, it remains too high – particularly when compared with recidivism statistics from previous years.



## FY 2011-12 Executive Budget

While the Legislature has recognized the need to reform our sentencing procedures by passing the Sentencing Reform Act this past session, it has failed to recognize the importance of adequately funding our prison and probation systems. South Carolina ranks last in the Southeast in funding per inmate per day at \$39.85 (Southeastern average is \$50.90). Despite continued underfunding, Corrections has accomplished remarkable efficiencies – from operating with a workforce that is 20 percent smaller, to producing its own eggs and grits, to leveraging the buying power of the State Health Plan and HHS to reduce medical costs. At the same time, Corrections has gone beyond mere efficiency by reducing escapes and assaults and setting new records for GED completions. Corrections was reviewed by the Legislative Audit Council and the National Institute Corrections, and both reviews gave the agency passing marks. As we have done the past two years, this year we request that the General Assembly fund Corrections as a core function of government and avoid another year of deficit spending.

**Average Operating Cost Per Inmate Day**



Likewise, PPP has seen the portion of its budget that is composed of general funds decline from 59 percent in fiscal year 2000 to 38 percent in fiscal year 2010. PPP meets the majority of its funding needs by collecting fees from offenders – a particularly fickle funding source during difficult economic times. PPP needs to receive a higher percentage of general funds.

### **Purchasing Priorities**

The major funding priorities are those that we feel best achieve our goals. The four key purchasing strategies, as determined by the FY 2010-11 Safety to People and Property results team, are defined as follows:

Prepare for and prevent criminal activities and natural and man-made emergencies. To ensure that an agency is prepared to prevent and manage criminal activity and natural or man-made emergencies, it must be adequately staffed, equipped, and trained.


Effectively manage the state's offender population. The goal of effectively managing offenders is the same as the goal of crime prevention – reduce the risks of harm to our citizens and their property.

To provide for the enforcement of state laws. The primary focus of our strategy is to ensure that agencies possess the tools necessary to enforce South Carolina's laws. SLED recognizes the need to address violent crime in our state and is doing so by embracing the formation of collaborative interagency law enforcement teams (local, state and federal) to better deal with violent crime in our state.

To provide for response and recovery activities following emergency situations. Once an emergency occurs, be it criminal activity or a natural disaster, the state must be prepared quickly to execute a response and recovery plan. A response and recovery plan may include activities such as criminal investigations, responses to traffic accidents, and disaster cleanups. An effective plan will increase the public's confidence in its safety.

**Governor's Purchasing Plan – Highlights**

As we address our state's unprecedented financial problems, we must focus on purchasing only those public safety services most needed by our citizens. In many cases, we have had to use cost savings methods simply to maintain current funding levels for high priority services. We do not purchase services that, while still considered valuable, have been identified as lower priorities. The following table identifies key purchases within our executive budget's total state public safety spending plan. Detailed highlights of our purchasing plan are provided below the table.

<b><i>Improve the Safety of People and Property</i></b>		
<b>Purchasing Plan:</b>		<b><u>Examples of what our plan buys:</u></b>
\$541,472,005 General Funds		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Highway Patrol troopers that will assist nearly 100,000 motorists and enforce commercial motor vehicle laws</li><li>▪ Resources for incarceration of 24,081 adult criminals</li><li>▪ Supervision of 47,797 adult jurisdictional offenders</li><li>▪ Increased funding for drug testing of offenders</li><li>▪ Funding for a Domestic Violence Fatality Review Project pilot program</li><li>▪ \$7.5 million to pay down the deficit at the Department of Corrections in FY 2010-11</li><li>▪ Funding for implementation of Ignition Interlock and Alcohol Enforcement Teams aimed at reducing underage drinking</li></ul>
\$886,887,518 Total Funds		
<b>Savings Proposal:</b>		<b><u>Examples of what our plan does not buy:</u></b>
\$ 3,807,455 General Funds		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Reduced food service expenses at the Department of Corrections associated with the implementation of the Egg-Laying/Pullet House, the Freezer Warehouse, and the Dairy Operations projects</li><li>▪ Duplicative parole boards for youths and adults</li></ul>

**Our Plan Buys:**

**Funding to fully implement the South Carolina Illegal Immigration Reform Act in FY 2011-12.** As of July 1, 2009, the South Carolina Illegal Immigration Reform Act requires businesses with 100 or more employees were required to have all new employees present either a valid South



Carolina drivers license or use the E-Verify mechanism prior to employment. On July 1, 2010, all businesses, including those with fewer than 100 employees, will have to meet the same requirement. Our administration believes that a law is only worthwhile if it is enforced. Our budget, therefore, proposes **\$2 million in recurring funds to enforce the South Carolina Illegal Immigration Reform Act.**

**Funding to pay down the deficit at the Department of Corrections in FY 2010-11.** Due to a lack of funding by the General Assembly, the Department of Corrections was forced to run a \$7.5 million deficit in FY 2010-11. We propose including **\$7.5 million** to pay down this deficit.

**Troopers and state transport police officers to patrol over 66,248 miles of state highways and enforce traffic laws, investigate collisions, assist motorists, and provide a safe motoring environment for the public.** During FY 2009-10, these troopers assisted 144,751 motorists, issued 15,494 DUI tickets, and investigated 75,130 collisions. Enforcement of commercial vehicle laws by State Transport Police (STP) resulted in 34,196 driver violations with 1,628 drivers placed out-of-service, and 66,597 vehicle violations, with 6,200 vehicles placed out-of-service. We propose to **recurring general funding of \$66.88 million** for this activity, including an **increase of \$5.56 million recurring funds and \$4.55 million non-recurring funds for more troopers.** The troopers will continue to help combat the state's high drunk driving rates as well as lower the Highway Patrol's response time to accidents.

**Funding for incarceration of 24,286 adult offenders at the state's seven high-security, eight medium-security, eleven minimum-security, and three female institutions.** These services provide for the proper housing, care, treatment, feeding, clothing, and supervision of inmates within a controlled and structured environment. We recommend **general funding of \$341 million from recurring dollars and non-recurring funding of \$3 million** for this activity.

**Community Supervision of 46,629 adult jurisdictional offenders.** These services include the regular supervision of adult offenders. In order to protect the safety of our agents in performing their duties, it is essential that they receive the proper safety training and equipment. We propose to **increase recurring funding** for this activity by providing **\$1.82 million in general funds and \$3 million in non-recurring funds** during FY 2010-11. This funding will go towards replacing safety items such as flashlights, holsters, and firearms, thereby providing agents with reliable weapons and reduce the costs of repair and upkeep.

**Offender Drug Testing Programs.** In many cases, PPP is required to administer regular drug tests to offenders. However, a lack of funding has made it difficult to perform this function, forcing funds to be taken from other activities. We propose **increasing funding** for this activity by **\$150,000** so all drug testing is completed to ensure that offenders are rehabilitated before completing probation.

**Implementation of Ignition Interlock.** On June 15, 2007, we signed into law the Prevention of Underage Drinking and Access to Alcohol Act. The Act establishes Alcohol Enforcement Teams aimed at reducing the incidents of underage drinking. Also included in the Act are provisions

requiring the use of ignition interlock devices for second and subsequent DUI offenses. Offenders are required to have their device inspected every sixty days, and the data from this inspection is sent to PPP. The revenue collected from the participants can be deposited into the Ignition Interlock Fund, thereby allowing the Fund to generate a cash balance that can be used to cover program expenditures in the future.

### **Our Plan Saves By:**

**Charging for traffic control services.** The Department of Public Safety provides traffic control services at various events throughout the year – most notably for college football games. Until the last legislative session, a proviso prevented the Department from charging for these services. We recommend that the Department to charge for providing traffic control services in FY 2011-12. This change will lead to **cost savings of \$647,702 annually** in general funds.

**Combining the Parole Boards at DJJ and PPP.** Currently, the state has separate parole boards at PPP and DJJ. The board at PPP has seven members and a budget of \$709,292, while the DJJ board has ten members and a budget of \$753,208. Despite having a larger budget, the DJJ board hears far fewer cases per year. Because these two parole boards have very similar missions, this presents an opportunity to gain efficiencies and savings by merging them. Combining the two boards will save **\$425,000** annually in general funds.

### **Making Tough Choices:**

Given the state's limited resources, we had to make some difficult choices regarding which activities to fund this year. Due to the budget cuts that the public safety agencies have already sustained, and the fact that public safety represents the core function of state government, we are not proposing additional cuts to state public safety agencies. However, we recommend the following:

**Seeking alternative funding for** the Adjutant General's Operations and Training and Public Information activities will result in a **reduction of \$63,607** in recurring general funds. We encourage those maintaining this unit to seek other funding so that this service may continue. Crowd control is part of the National Guard's core mission.

*Please see the Appendices for a complete listing of the Governor's Purchasing Plan for this goal area and for a detailed listing of what our plan saves and what our plan does not buy.*

Improve the Efficiencies and  
Effectiveness of Central State  
Government Support and Other  
Governmental Services

## Improve the Efficiencies and Effectiveness of Central State Government Support and Other Governmental Services

Our state government's antiquated structure prevents it from providing the most efficient and effective services to taxpayers. Our administration thinks it is past time to release government from the shackles of the past by changing the policies and structures of specific agencies as well as government statewide.

Examples of this antiquated system of state government include an executive branch structure where only 16 of more than 70 executive agencies report directly to the governor; more than 2,000 different, uncoordinated computer servers are spread across state agencies; state agencies with multiple accounting and network systems that do not integrate well; and a Chief Information Officer reports to a board of five different elected officials and has little authority to effectively manage information systems in this state.

Government should be most accountable to those who pay for it – the taxpayers. This administration continues to push for policies that will provide an efficient and effective government that maximizes value to taxpayers. A good first step in this process would be creating a Department of Administration within the governor's cabinet, which would perform the administrative functions currently performed by the Budget and Control Board. In this section of the budget, we propose ways to improve the structures and policies of central state government and other governmental services that will make them operate more efficiently and effectively.

### Administration's Goals for Improving the Efficiencies and Effectiveness of Central State Government Support and Other Governmental Services are to:

- ✓ Reduce fractured lines of responsibility in the executive branch of government.
- ✓ Modernize state information technology regulations to improve cost efficiency to state agencies.
- ✓ Manage state-owned assets more cost effectively.
- ✓ Centralize state accounting systems to improve productivity.
- ✓ Fix our retirement system so it can meet its obligations.

### Developing Our Purchasing Priorities

To develop our purchasing priorities, we first identified major indicators of success related to the goal of improving the structures and policies of central state government. These indicators measure whether state government is currently reaching its goal of operating efficiently and effectively. We found South Carolina is performing well in some areas; however, there are many opportunities for improvement.

*Where We Are Succeeding*

The South Carolina Department of Revenue (DOR) continues to be a national leader in the percentage of individual income tax returns that are filed by electronic/non-paper methods. In 2009, 73 percent of all South Carolina taxpayers filed their tax returns electronically over the last year, which is an increase of over 4 percent from 2008. That means that more than 1.3 million South Carolina taxpayers are filing by computer. South Carolina's high percentage of electronic filing keeps South Carolina as one of the top 10 states for electronic filing.

The increase in electronic filing in the last year is partly due to DOR's efforts to provide free filing for all South Carolina taxpayers who earn \$31,000 or less, who are 65 years of age or older, 25 years of age or younger, or active duty military. DOR was able to provide this benefit by joining the Free File Alliance, which is a group of 21 states that have partnered with private software companies to provide free tax filing services. DOR estimates that approximately 43,800 taxpayers were able to take advantage of the free file program in 2010.

As a result of DOR's efforts on this front over the last several years, many South Carolinians have begun filing their tax returns earlier in the year. DOR reached the one-million-electronic-filer milestone on March 16, 2010; however, it did not reach this mark in 2008 until March 24. Filing earlier allows taxpayers to get their tax refunds earlier. In summary, DOR's efforts have saved significant cost and time for the agency, the state, and the taxpayer.

This administration realizes the need to equip the small business community with the necessary tools to succeed in this global economy. With that in mind, DOR has worked with the Department of Commerce and other key agencies to implement and operate the South Carolina Business One Stop. Specifically, SCBOS guides potential new business owners through the process of starting a business while making it easier for existing business owners to file and pay for business licenses. Bringing new industries into the state leads to new jobs, and many of these jobs are created by the very backbone of our economy – small businesses. Over 97 percent of all businesses in South Carolina are small businesses. They stimulate economic activity, attract capital investment, and, most importantly, create new jobs. This focus on small businesses and providing an environment for them to succeed is important for our state to remain competitive.

At our initiative, the Budget and Control Board has approved several changes to the State Health Plan that will both lower health care costs for the Plan as well as improve the health and lives of our state's employees. First, in January 2010, the Board implemented our proposal to add a \$25 per month insurance premium surcharge on tobacco users, and the Board adopted our proposal to raise the smoking surcharge to \$40 for single-subscribers and \$60 for family-subscribers for the next Plan year. The surcharge is expected to reduce health care costs in the future by discouraging tobacco use and will result in smokers paying a more equitable share of the health care costs that result from tobacco usage. Second, as we have suggested in previous executive budgets, the Board imposed a cap on benefits for chiropractic care to limit the abuse exacted by some employees. Although we would have preferred a lower cap, the Board-approved chiropractic care limit of \$2,000 will save the Plan approximately \$6.98 million in this Plan year. Third, the Board adopted our proposal to

develop an employee wellness plan geared to improving chronic conditions such as heart disease, diabetes, and obesity. The plan approved by the Board will provide generic drug incentives to employees who participate in educational program, and it is expected to result in \$5.3 million in annual savings to the State Health Plan.

### ***Opportunities for Improvement***

On February 26, 2007, Governor Sanford issued an executive order creating the nine-member Government Efficiency and Accountability Review (GEAR) Committee. The committee was instructed to “analyze the systems and services within and provided by the South Carolina Budget and Control Board in an effort to propose changes which will reduce costs, increase accountability, improve services, consolidate similar functions, return functions to the private sector and help South Carolina become more competitive in a world economy.” The committee’s report examined how the Budget and Control Board and other areas of state government could streamline their operations and save the taxpayers over **\$500 million**. To date, the Budget and Control Board and the General Assembly have either implemented or are in the process of implementing 16 of the committee’s 61 recommendations to improve central state government. We commend the Board and the General Assembly for taking these steps; however, the rest of the recommendations need to be implemented to better serve the taxpayers of South Carolina.

In 2008, 2009, and 2010, the General Assembly came close to passing legislation that would have placed purely administrative state government functions under a cabinet-level Department of Administration. While the House passed these bills, they died in the Senate toward the end of the legislative sessions. We once again call on the General Assembly to pass this meaningful legislation that will help modernize state government.

There are many areas in government where we can be better stewards of the taxpayers’ money by providing services in a more efficient and effective manner. One of the primary areas that should be looked at is state travel. The Legislative Audit Council (LAC) report on state travel, released in July 2007, reveals numerous areas where we are not being cost efficient. The LAC report noted, “There is no centralized office that is responsible for managing travel by South Carolina state agencies to ensure that travel expenditures are efficient and cost effective.” The report states that a centralized office could “use its volume of travel to reduce costs, improve communication and training about travel policies, and develop expertise in travel practices.” For example, a centralized state travel office could negotiate and purchase bulk travel from hotels, conference centers, and airlines. The LAC report estimates that the annual cost savings to the taxpayers would be **\$1.6 million** if the state used its bulk purchasing power to obtain contracts with airlines.

The administration continues to push for more flexibility in the human resources policies of state government. Currently, our managers do not have the tools needed to run agencies effectively. Outdated regulations tie the hands of directors, preventing them from getting the most out of their employees. In fact, we have a system that makes it virtually impossible to remove that an employee from the state payroll after a standard probationary period. This system has created a government with only two percent of employees being “at-will,” which is almost unheard of in the private sector.

---

## **IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCIES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF CENTRAL STATE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT AND OTHER GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES**

The number of state employees in South Carolina is higher than the regional and national averages partly because of inefficient human resources policies. According to the Census Bureau's most recent data, South Carolina has 234 government employees per 10,000 in population, which is 35 percent more than the national average of 174 state employees per 10,000 in population. By comparison, North Carolina had 229, Georgia 179, Texas 157, and Florida only had 120 employees per 10,000 in population – almost half that of South Carolina. We suggest updated human resource regulations and more efficient administrative policies are needed to put us in line with the rest of the nation.

One way to reduce the unnecessarily high number of state employees is to address the rate at which retired employees enroll in the Teacher and Employee Retention Incentive (TERI) program. Agencies have an opportunity to demonstrate fiscal prudence with the taxpayers' money by rehiring TERI employees only in extreme cases. However, current law allows an agency to rehire the former TERI employee if he or she is separated from the agency for only one day. This scenario forces the taxpayer to pay an employee's salary in addition to an employee's retirement package. For this reason, we are recommending that agency directors evaluate former TERI employee job duties to determine if they may be distributed among others in the agency, while also looking to hire qualified individuals that may be trained for the long run. We recommend that the agencies do not hire the majority of these employees back – as many agencies already plan to do – and disburse job duties among remaining employees, while also hiring new individuals who will be trained for the long-run. This proposal will save **\$5,695,777** in general funds.



### **Purchasing Priorities**

Having determined where we are succeeding and where opportunities for improvement exist, we next identified some proven or promising strategies to determine our purchasing priorities and best achieve our goals. The key strategies we identified are as follows:

Provide effective and efficient central state human resources support. Managers and employees need more flexibility to provide effective service to citizens in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Our proposed changes to human resources regulations and staffing will save taxpayers money and increase managers' ability to change their agencies' staffing plans as changing circumstances require. We encourage the General Assembly to modernize state human resources regulations to improve efficiency.

Provide effective and efficient central state information technology support. Many agencies across the state are not using the most efficient means in maintaining their websites and other technological operations. With the recent contractual agreement between the state and South Carolina Interactive, a private information technology provider, it is essential that South Carolina Interactive effectively market the benefits of online services that will save the state and taxpayers money. We would push to reduce technology costs that all state agencies are forced to pay.


Provide effective and efficient central state administrative support. By disposing of excess property and co-locating state agencies that deal directly with the public, citizens can take care of state business without having to travel to a myriad of locations. We will continue to push for a more cost-efficient method to operate our fleet of vehicles across the state, including cost savings from recommendations in the recent vehicle study. We will also push to create a system that is more efficient regarding state-owned assets.

Provide accountability to the citizens of South Carolina in all state government services. We need to pass restructuring legislation to make the executive branch more accountable to taxpayers. Our restructuring proposal is a step in the right direction toward making key functions of state government, primarily health care, education, and administration, answerable to the Governor's Office and thus to voters. Reducing the fractured lines of responsibility in the executive branch of government is imperative.



## **Governor's Purchasing Plan – Highlights**

As we address our state's unprecedented financial problems, it is important to focus on purchasing only those central state administrative functions most needed by our agencies. In many cases, we have had to use cost savings methods to simply maintain current funding levels for high priority services. We do not purchase services that, while still considered valuable, have been identified as lower priority. The following table identifies key purchases within our executive budget's total state administrative services spending plan as well as examples of what is not purchased. Detailed highlights of our purchasing plan are provided below the table.

<p><b><i>Improve the Efficiencies and Effectiveness of Central State Government Support and Other Governmental Services</i></b></p>		<p><b><u>Examples of what our plan buys:</u></b></p>
<p><b>Purchasing Plan:</b></p> <p>\$546,733,337 General Funds</p> <p>\$1,096,977,042 Total Funds</p> <p><b>Savings Proposal:</b></p> <p>\$101,666,748 General Funds</p>		<p><b><u>Examples of what our plan does not buy:</u></b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Funding for the creation of a Sunset Commission</li> <li>▪ Creation of a Central State Travel Office to save on travel expenditures statewide</li> <li>▪ A statewide accounting system (with reform to the current IT structure)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Administrative excess in the CIO's office</li> <li>▪ Agency premiums paid into the Unemployment Compensation Fund in excess of maintenance levels</li> <li>▪ Inefficiencies at the Budget and Control Board highlighted by the GEAR report</li> <li>▪ Health care premium increases for state agencies</li> </ul>

## **Our Plan Buys:**

**Establishment of a Sunset Commission to evaluate whether government programs should be continued.** In the past, the House of Representatives has adopted a measure which would have created a Sunset Commission as described earlier in our "Modernize Government" section. In 2008, the Senate appeared ready to adopt a legislatively-controlled version of a Sunset Commission, which we supported. We hope the General Assembly will reconsider this much-needed commission especially in light of our current fiscal crisis. Our budget provides **new funding of \$500,000** for the creation of a Sunset Commission.

**IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCIES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF  
CENTRAL STATE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT AND OTHER  
GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES**

**Tax collections, compliance, and processing.** In recent years, our cost to collect taxes has been reduced to \$.00782 per dollar. At the same time, enforced collections now exceed \$755 million, with total collections exceeding \$7 billion. Noting this, we propose to provide funding of \$19,044,941 in general funds for tax collections, compliance, and processing during FY 2011-12.

**Taxpayer assistance.** Taxpayer assistance includes the Contact Center as well as regional and satellite offices that provide statutory compliance with registration, licenses, and explanation of correspondence and forms. Taxpayers need a clear, trustworthy channel of communication to answer questions about their taxes. We propose to general funding at \$3,234,047 for taxpayer assistance during FY 2011-12.

**Statewide budget development analysis and implementation.** The Budget and Control Board's Office of State Budget (OSB) assists the governor and General Assembly in the preparation and implementation of the annual state budget. We propose to **maintain funding** at **\$2,283,097** in general funds for the OSB during FY 2011-12.

**A Central State Travel Office.** South Carolina has over 70 agencies that make travel decisions without standardized regulations or central coordination. In 2007, the LAC recommended that we create a central travel office to oversee each agency's travel practices and ensure the state's travel expenses are as low as practicable. We recommend creating a Central State Travel Office, which will establish clear guidelines to ensure that each agency utilizes taxpayer dollars in the most efficient manner for state travel needs. This new office will also generate savings by negotiating bulk airline and hotel/motel purchases. This proposal will **save \$5,977,985 in general funds**.

**An integrated financial reporting and management system for the state, which is essential to standard and meaningful multi-year technology planning.** In previous years, we have indicated our concerns that the state's current information technology system wastes millions of taxpayer dollars and hinders effective oversight. Here, we reiterate our call to create a cabinet-level Department of Administration to manage state's information technology responsibilities. Currently, the state's Chief Information Officer (CIO) has no direct responsibility or authority to deliver IT services to South Carolinians, yet it has unique authority over one of the principle means of improving IT services and reducing the costs of government. Unfortunately, the CIO – which is overseen by the five separately-elected members of the Budget and Control Board – is insulated from accountability by several layers of government bureaucracy.

If the General Assembly adopts a restructuring plan to make the CIO more accountable to the Governor during the next legislative session, we will support **maintaining funding** in the amount of **\$2 million** for the continuation of the five-year South Carolina Enterprise Information System project. We believe this is an opportunity significantly to reform and improve South Carolina's government.

**Our Plan Saves By:**

**Moving to night-time cleaning services for most state offices.** The Facilities Management Office of the General Services Division currently provides daytime custodial services five days a week for most buildings they manage. The Facilities Management Office reports that it would be more efficient to clean offices at night when they are not occupied. In fact, most government and private-sector offices receive janitorial services at night. State agencies that lease property from the private sector – including the many divisions of the Budget and Control Board – receive standard nightly cleaning service with no reported problems. This simple and logical change would **save** the taxpayers approximately **\$1,000,000 annually**.

**Restructuring for a more accountable executive branch.** Many government agencies provide the same or similar services throughout our state, creating a duplicative system that is not only inefficient but also raises the costs for taxpayers. Our proposals to restructure state government are focused on (1) reducing the number of elected constitutional officers, (2) consolidating agencies that deliver health care services into one, cabinet-level agency, (3) further reforming the Department of Transportation, and (4) moving the Budget and Control Board's administrative functions into a cabinet-level Department of Administration. These proposals would save the state nearly **\$16 million in the first year**.

**Reducing the retail lottery commissions to approximately the national average.** In previous budgets, we have advocated that we reduce retail lottery commissions and use a greater percentage of the lottery-related funds to provide more money for education. Data from lotteries across the country show there is no correlation between a higher retail commission and higher lottery sales. In fact, one study showed that the top 10 lotteries across the nation in sales had average per capita sales of \$581 compared to South Carolina's \$229 per capita sales. However, the same states had a retail commission that was one full percentage point less than ours and one-tenth lower than the national average of six percent.

When the Education Lottery was established, retail commissions were set at a minimum of seven percent. If sales for the lottery's first year had been \$500 million as predicted, then retailers would have shared in commissions of approximately \$35 million. As lottery sales are now more than \$1 billion annually, commissions are more \$71 million. In other words, retailers signed up for a program that projected average annual commissions of \$10,000 each, but they have enjoyed an average annual commission of more than \$19,000 per retailer. A reduction of retailers' commissions from seven percent to the approximate national average of six percent will still leave retailers making an average of over \$16,000 per store – 60 percent more than the initial projections. More importantly, paying retailers a six percent commission will free up an estimated **\$9,519,064 annually** that can be used for education.

**Reducing the number of participants in the Teacher and Employee Retention Incentive (TERI) program.** In many instances, TERI has accomplished its goal – retaining experienced teachers and good workers in critical positions of government. However, in many other instances, it has prevented qualified individuals from entering the state's workforce. In some ways, the TERI

program has been unfair to South Carolina taxpayers because it asks them to contribute more tax dollars to high-salaried managers who were able to take advantage of the system. In fact, TERI employees are paid \$17,000 more than the average non-TERI state employee.

We recommend that agencies rehire TERI employees only in extreme circumstances. Agencies should disburse job duties among remaining employees and look to hire and train new employees so that the agency can better cope with our current budget constraints. According to the Human Resource Office in the Budget and Control Board, if each agency's budget were reduced by taking the difference between the average TERI employee salary and the average salary for that agency, we would realize an annual cost savings of **\$5,695,777**. We want to make it clear that this proposal is not about terminating any current employees but instead represents the natural process of replacing most positions with less tenured individuals at lower pay.

**Eliminating vendor preferences in the procurement code.** South Carolina's state procurement code provides SC-resident vendors a seven percent preference when they bid for certain state government contracts. While these preferences give resident vendors a competitive advantage over out-of-state vendors, they add a significant expense to the state agencies' cost of doing business. Audit reports from the Materials Management Office in the Budget and Control Board show that these preferences have cost South Carolina state agencies more than **\$1.3 million** over the past 10 years, in addition to discouraging out-of-state vendors from doing business in out state. Eliminating the vendor preference will save the state approximately **\$150,000** annually.

**Implementing efficient cell phone, pager, and satellite phone policies.** In June 2008, the LAC issued its audit report of state agency wireless communication usage. The report found that South Carolina state agencies spent more than \$7 million on cell phones, \$790,000 on pagers, and \$68,000 on satellite phones in FY 2005-06. Unfortunately, many agencies waste thousands of dollars a year on cell phones and other devices because the agencies have inadequate usage and employee-monitoring policies. To remedy these wasteful practices, the LAC made several recommendations that will reduce the state's total expenditures on cell phones and other devices. These recommendations include for all agencies to review their cell phone plans and choose the most cost-effective plan suitable to their needs, improve procedures for preventing overcharges, comply with IRS regulations regarding personal use of state-issued cell phones, and prohibit state employees from making directory assistance calls. We believe that the LAC recommendations will help eliminate government waste, and we therefore include the recommendations in our executive budget. Our proposal will result in cost savings of over **\$751,410** according to the LAC.

### **Making Tough Choices:**

Given the state's current financial restraints, we had to make some difficult choices regarding which activities to fund this year. Although the activities listed below may have merit, we did not think they will further our goal of making state government as efficient as possible. The following reflects some of those difficult choices:

---

## **IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCIES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF CENTRAL STATE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT AND OTHER GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES**

**Requiring all state employees to choose two holidays without pay.** In an effort to find cost savings during a tight budget year, we propose requiring all state employees to choose two state holidays that they would like to take unpaid during FY 2011-12. State employees currently have 13 paid holidays during the calendar year.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, state and local government employees nationwide receive an average of 11 days of paid vacation per year. The average private-sector employee receives eight paid holidays. Therefore, reducing our total number of paid holidays from 13 to 11 would be keeping in line with the national average and still place us above the private-sector holiday average. Other states, including Utah, Maryland, California, and New Jersey, have taken a similar approach. In addition, several private corporations have begun imposing unpaid holidays. Our proposal will save more money than a voluntary furlough because, unlike furloughs, state offices are closed on holidays – saving operational and utility expenses. Implementing this proposal for FY 2011-12 for nearly 65,000 state employees will result in a **cost savings of \$12.7 million.**

*Please see the Appendices for a complete listing of the Governor's Purchase Plan for this goal area and for a detailed listing of what our plan saves and what our plan does not buy.*

# APPENDICES

# Revenue and Allocation Summary

# FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan

## Revenue and Allocations Summary

Revenue Summary									
Revenue Sources	General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds
<b>General Fund Revenue</b>									
FY 2011-12 BEA Revenue Estimate	5,863,933,851								
Less: Tax Relief Trust Fund	(545,680,709)								
Less: FY 2011-12 General Reserve Fund Transfer	(17,141,169)								
Net General Fund Revenue Forecast	5,301,111,973								5,301,111,973
<b>Other/Federal Revenue Sources</b>									
FY 2011-12 Other/Federal Funds Projections		9,606,854,755	6,857,200,564						16,464,055,319
FY 2011-12 Lottery Projections					268,761,200				268,761,200
FY 2011-12 EIA Projections				563,498,984					563,498,984
<b>Nonrecurring Revenue Sources</b>									
A.R.R.A. State Fiscal Stabilization Funding								501,948	501,948
FY 2010-11 Capital Reserve Fund						110,883,455			110,883,455
Cigarette Tax - Medicaid Reserve Fund			119,750,233				105,595,954		225,346,187
FY 2009-10 Contingency Reserve Fund							71,000,600		71,000,600
FY 2010-11 Projected Year End Surplus							20,645,792		20,645,792
Remittance to GF for 5% Pay Reduction (Other Funds)	42,775,904								42,775,904
Film Incentives	18,835,902								18,835,902
Tobacco Deallocation							10,000,000		10,000,000
Sale of Property - B&C Board - Tempo Building							2,000,000		2,000,000
Transfer of Cash from DHEC Waste Funds	3,356,566								3,356,566
Transfer of Cash from DMV (Notices/Correspondence)	325,000								325,000
Transfer of Cash from DMV (10-Year License)	773,000								773,000
License Plate Replacement (N/R)	2,300,000								2,300,000
Documentary Stamp Tax to Conservation Bank	7,887,460								7,887,460
Subtotal, Nonrecurring Revenues	76,253,832	-	119,750,233	-	-	110,883,455	209,242,346	501,948	516,631,814
Total Available Revenue	5,377,365,805	9,606,854,755	6,976,950,797	563,498,984	268,761,200	110,883,455	209,242,346	501,948	23,114,059,290
Grand Total Recommended Allocations	(5,377,365,805)	(9,606,854,755)	(6,976,950,797)	(563,498,984)	(268,761,200)	(110,883,455)	(209,242,346)	(501,948)	(23,114,059,290)
Residual Balance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Allocations Summary									
Functional Groups	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds
K-12 Education & Special Schools	1,908,794,068	808,769,807	79,966,129	563,498,984	49,814,527	-	91,646,392	-	3,502,489,907
Higher Education & Cultural	491,788,726	693,088,235	2,980,575,220	-	218,946,673	5,000,000	-	-	4,389,398,854
Health & Social Rehabilitation	1,521,435,459	7,547,852,503	1,809,491,287	-	-	77,772,308	115,595,954	501,948	11,072,649,459
Economic Development	73,699,832	227,569,799	1,486,149,524	-	-	5,000,000	-	-	1,792,419,155
Public Safety	535,912,804	76,927,690	260,319,161	-	-	11,727,863	2,000,000	-	886,887,518
Natural Resources	33,521,029	65,361,729	75,143,727	-	-	-	-	-	174,026,485
Central State Government	613,003,017	187,284,992	285,305,749	-	-	11,383,284	-	-	1,096,977,042
Debt Service	199,210,870	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	199,210,870
Total	5,377,365,805	9,606,854,755	6,976,950,797	563,498,984	268,761,200	110,883,455	209,242,346	501,948	23,114,059,290



[illegible]

FY 2010-11 VS. FY 2011-12	
---------------------------	--

[illegible]

	FY 2010-11				FY 2011-12				
	General Funds	% of Total	Total Funds	% of Total	General Funds	% of Total	Total Funds	% of Total	
Functional Area									
K-12 Education & Special Schools	\$ 1,896,963,083	37.3%	\$ 3,558,922,783	16.3%	\$ 1,960,322,743	36.5%	\$ 3,502,489,907	15.2%	
Higher Education & Cultural	588,925,316	11.6%	4,412,492,972	20.2%	499,027,299	9.3%	4,389,398,854	19.0%	
Health & Social Rehabilitation	1,210,156,183	23.8%	9,454,041,675	43.3%	1,526,781,014	28.4%	11,072,649,459	47.9%	
Economic Development	70,607,816	1.4%	1,989,437,282	9.1%	74,485,731	1.4%	1,792,419,155	7.8%	
Public Safety	495,781,603	9.8%	914,835,490	4.2%	541,472,005	10.1%	886,887,518	3.8%	
Natural Resources	58,708,702	1.2%	205,031,668	0.9%	34,332,806	0.6%	174,026,485	0.8%	
Central State Government	548,994,229	10.8%	1,064,497,932	4.9%	541,733,337	10.1%	1,096,977,042	4.7%	
Debt Service	210,236,963	4.1%	210,236,963	1.0%	199,210,870	3.7%	199,210,870	0.9%	
Total	\$ 5,080,373,895	100.0%	\$ 21,809,496,765	100.0%	\$ 5,377,365,805	100.0%	\$ 23,114,059,290	100.0%	
Note: FY 2011-12 functional areas include estimated allocation to agencies for Health Plan increase and annualization.									

# Executive Budget Purchase Plan

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
<b>A01</b>	<b>The Senate</b>	<b>12,409,112</b>								<b>12,409,112</b>	<b>189.00</b>
-	Agency Base Adjustment	(3,835,896)								(3,835,896)	
-	Legislative Policy Setting	(182,000)								(182,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(390,424)								(390,424)	
-	Central Travel Office	(64,269)								(64,269)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(768)								(768)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(7,881)								(7,881)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(5,857)								(5,857)	
	<b>A01 Total</b>	<b>7,922,017</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>7,922,017</b>	<b>189.00</b>
<b>A05</b>	<b>House of Representatives</b>	<b>16,395,210</b>								<b>16,395,210</b>	<b>251.00</b>
-	Agency Base Adjustment	(2,160,394)								(2,160,394)	
-	Legislative Policy Setting	(486,100)								(486,100)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(198,048)								(198,048)	
-	Central Travel Office	(150,343)								(150,343)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(524)								(524)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(9,194)								(9,194)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(8,243)								(8,243)	
	<b>A05 Total</b>	<b>13,382,364</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>13,382,364</b>	<b>251.00</b>
<b>A15</b>	<b>Codification of Laws &amp; Legislative Council</b>	<b>2,429,469</b>		<b>300,000</b>						<b>2,729,469</b>	<b>46.00</b>
-	5% Salary Reduction	(87,627)								(87,627)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(144)								(144)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,368)								(1,368)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(278)								(278)	
	<b>A15 Total</b>	<b>2,340,052</b>	-	<b>300,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>2,640,052</b>	<b>46.00</b>
<b>A17</b>	<b>Legislative Printing</b>	<b>2,792,324</b>								<b>2,792,324</b>	<b>33.00</b>
-	5% Salary Reduction	(88,742)								(88,742)	
-	Central Travel Office	(40)								(40)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(611)								(611)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(799)								(799)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,204)								(1,204)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(20)								(20)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(964)								(964)	
	<b>A17 Total</b>	<b>2,699,944</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>2,699,944</b>	<b>33.00</b>
<b>A20</b>	<b>Legislative Audit Council</b>	<b>855,499</b>								<b>855,499</b>	<b>26.00</b>
-	Performance Auditing	112,000								112,000	
-	Sunset Commission	500,000								500,000	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(35,803)								(35,803)	
-	Central Travel Office	(75)								(75)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(131)								(131)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(930)								(930)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(736)								(736)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(2,853)								(2,853)	
	<b>A20 Total</b>	<b>1,426,971</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>1,426,971</b>	<b>26.00</b>
<b>A85</b>	<b>Education Oversight Committee</b>	-		<b>1,476,748</b>						<b>1,476,748</b>	<b>10.00</b>
	<b>A85 Total</b>	-	-	<b>1,476,748</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>1,476,748</b>	<b>10.00</b>
<b>B04</b>	<b>Judicial Department</b>	<b>37,631,743</b>	<b>7,558,285</b>	<b>22,060,630</b>						<b>67,250,658</b>	<b>585.47</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(1,049,099)	(3,096,830)						(4,145,929)	
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	-					5,100,000			5,100,000	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(170,174)								(170,174)	
-	Central Travel Office	(151,493)								(151,493)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(71,988)								(71,988)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(22,158)								(22,158)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(5,057)								(5,057)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(128,228)								(128,228)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(101,299)								(101,299)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(17,087)								(17,087)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(3,171)								(3,171)	
	<b>B04 Total</b>	<b>36,961,088</b>	<b>6,509,186</b>	<b>18,963,800</b>	-	-	<b>5,100,000</b>	-	-	<b>67,534,074</b>	<b>585.47</b>
<b>C05</b>	<b>Administrative Law Court</b>	<b>1,550,518</b>		<b>1,305,240</b>						<b>2,855,758</b>	<b>44.00</b>
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	-								-	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(24,863)								(24,863)	
-	Central Travel Office	(1,582)								(1,582)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(257)								(257)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(970)								(970)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(5,246)								(5,246)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(1,064)								(1,064)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(810)								(810)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(371)								(371)	
	<b>C05 Total</b>	<b>1,515,355</b>	-	<b>1,305,240</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>2,820,595</b>	<b>44.00</b>
<b>D05</b>	<b>Governor's Office - ECS</b>	<b>1,825,407</b>								<b>1,825,407</b>	<b>37.00</b>
-	5% Salary Reduction	(66,849)								(66,849)	
-	Central Travel Office	(916)								(916)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(11,258)								(11,258)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(202)								(202)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,095)								(1,095)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(1,562)								(1,562)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(23,082)								(23,082)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(4,005)								(4,005)	
<b>D05 Total</b>		<b>1,716,438</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,716,438</b>	<b>37.00</b>
<b>D10</b>	<b>Governor's Office - SLED</b>	<b>23,922,357</b>	<b>25,283,910</b>	<b>14,768,557</b>						<b>63,974,824</b>	<b>649.24</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	658,190							658,190	
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds							2,000,000		2,000,000	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(989,337)								(989,337)	
-	Central Travel Office	(26,761)								(26,761)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(28,616)								(28,616)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(22,570)								(22,570)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(185,852)								(185,852)	
-	Consolidate Maintenance Facilities in Columbia	(23,040)								(23,040)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(134,676)								(134,676)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(3,162)								(3,162)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(47,117)								(47,117)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(22,903)								(22,903)	
<b>D10 Total</b>		<b>22,438,323</b>	<b>25,942,100</b>	<b>14,768,557</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>65,148,980</b>	<b>649.24</b>
<b>D17</b>	<b>Governor's Office - OEPP</b>	<b>7,008,507</b>	<b>40,398,365</b>	<b>23,366,075</b>						<b>70,772,947</b>	<b>243.13</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	43,238,846	5,454,921						48,693,767	
-	Transfer Agency Functions from Minority Affairs	191,158		331,000						522,158	10.00
-	Administration - Restructuring	(70,548)								(70,548)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(192,053)								(192,053)	
-	Central Travel Office	(25,474)								(25,474)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(28,768)								(28,768)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(1,162)								(1,162)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(7,552)								(7,552)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(163,568)								(163,568)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(2,963)								(2,963)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(17,830)								(17,830)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(95)								(95)	
<b>D17 Total</b>		<b>6,689,652</b>	<b>83,637,211</b>	<b>29,151,996</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>119,478,859</b>	<b>253.13</b>
<b>D20</b>	<b>Governor's Office - Mansion</b>	<b>341,930</b>		<b>275,000</b>						<b>616,930</b>	<b>15.00</b>
-	5% Salary Reduction	(10,160)								(10,160)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(274)								(274)	
<b>D20 Total</b>		<b>331,496</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>275,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>606,496</b>	<b>15.00</b>
<b>E04</b>	<b>Lieutenant Governor</b>	<b>4,356,135</b>	<b>27,468,917</b>	<b>4,330,000</b>						<b>36,155,052</b>	<b>53.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		920,160							920,160	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(48,638)								(48,638)	
-	Central Travel Office	(6,609)								(6,609)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(436)								(436)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,473)								(1,473)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(4,004)								(4,004)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(1,985)								(1,985)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(2,833)								(2,833)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(1,521)								(1,521)	
-	Local Provider Salary Supplement	(78,000)								(78,000)	
-	Geriatric Physician Program	(35,000)								(35,000)	
-	Silver Haired Legislature	(13,500)								(13,500)	
<b>E04 Total</b>		<b>4,162,136</b>	<b>28,389,077</b>	<b>4,330,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>36,881,213</b>	<b>53.00</b>
<b>E08</b>	<b>Secretary of State</b>	<b>623,371</b>		<b>1,651,234</b>						<b>2,274,605</b>	<b>29.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			(83,579)						(83,579)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(18,762)								(18,762)	
-	Central Travel Office	(132)								(132)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(7,017)								(7,017)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(476)								(476)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(706)								(706)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(13,368)								(13,368)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(557)								(557)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(2,282)								(2,282)	
<b>E08 Total</b>		<b>580,071</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,567,655</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,147,726</b>	<b>29.00</b>
<b>E12</b>	<b>Comptroller General</b>	<b>2,119,668</b>		<b>830,000</b>						<b>2,949,668</b>	<b>67.00</b>
-	Military Base Closure Task Force	200,000								200,000	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(87,183)								(87,183)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(14,304)								(14,304)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(219)								(219)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,989)								(1,989)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(19,176)								(19,176)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(126)								(126)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(2,880)								(2,880)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
<b>E12 Total</b>		<b>2,193,791</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>830,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,023,791</b>	<b>67.00</b>
<b>E16</b>	<b>State Treasurer</b>	<b>1,610,345</b>		<b>7,492,433</b>						<b>9,102,778</b>	<b>70.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			170,292						170,292	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(58,906)								(58,906)	
-	Central Travel Office	(780)								(780)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(16,428)								(16,428)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(2,864)								(2,864)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,751)								(1,751)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(22,540)								(22,540)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(2,422)								(2,422)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(3,227)								(3,227)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(41)								(41)	
<b>E16 Total</b>		<b>1,501,386</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,662,725</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9,164,111</b>	<b>70.00</b>
<b>E19</b>	<b>Retirement Investment Commission</b>	<b>-</b>		<b>5,810,714</b>						<b>5,810,714</b>	<b>23.00</b>
<b>E19 Total</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,810,714</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,810,714</b>	<b>23.00</b>
<b>E20</b>	<b>Attorney General</b>	<b>3,742,504</b>	<b>1,909,000</b>	<b>10,254,906</b>						<b>15,906,410</b>	<b>167.25</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		104,000	496,800						600,800	
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	-					500,000			500,000	
-	Medicaid Fraud & Prevention	150,000								150,000	
-	Transfer Agency Functions from Human Affairs	614,332	177,528	411,100						1,202,960	47.00
-	Transfer Agency Functions from Consumer Affairs	595,345		1,924,295						2,519,640	65.00
-	5% Salary Reduction	(152,326)								(152,326)	
-	Central Travel Office	(18,135)								(18,135)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(42,726)								(42,726)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(3,260)								(3,260)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(5,892)								(5,892)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(55,830)								(55,830)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(14,148)								(14,148)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(6,361)								(6,361)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(1,979)								(1,979)	
<b>E20 Total</b>		<b>4,801,524</b>	<b>2,190,528</b>	<b>13,087,101</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20,579,153</b>	<b>279.25</b>
<b>E21</b>	<b>Prosecution Coordination Commission</b>	<b>8,720,087</b>	<b>162,334</b>	<b>6,579,277</b>						<b>15,461,698</b>	<b>41.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-		(819,526)						(819,526)	
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	1,000,000								1,000,000	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(175,133)								(175,133)	
-	Central Travel Office	(4,652)								(4,652)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(336)								(336)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,861)								(1,861)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(10,804)								(10,804)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(1,144)								(1,144)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(2,092)								(2,092)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(3,722)								(3,722)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(327)								(327)	
<b>E21 Total</b>		<b>9,520,016</b>	<b>162,334</b>	<b>5,759,751</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>15,442,101</b>	<b>41.00</b>
<b>E23</b>	<b>Commission on Indigent Defense</b>	<b>8,486,441</b>		<b>13,175,652</b>						<b>21,662,093</b>	<b>67.00</b>
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	1,000,000								1,000,000	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(273,361)								(273,361)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(196,784)								(196,784)	
-	Central Travel Office	(6,571)								(6,571)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(380)								(380)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(2,836)								(2,836)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(81,164)								(81,164)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(3,579)								(3,579)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(3,560)								(3,560)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(221)								(221)	
<b>E23 Total</b>		<b>8,917,985</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13,175,652</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>22,093,637</b>	<b>67.00</b>
<b>E24</b>	<b>Adjutant General</b>	<b>4,487,202</b>	<b>54,571,634</b>	<b>7,791,850</b>						<b>66,850,686</b>	<b>165.50</b>
-	TERI Savings	(15,957)								(15,957)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(99,373)								(99,373)	
-	Central Travel Office	(29,055)								(29,055)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(41,652)								(41,652)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(11,265)								(11,265)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(4,259)								(4,259)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(157,184)								(157,184)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(22,035)								(22,035)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(3,543)								(3,543)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(28,146)								(28,146)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(40,778)								(40,778)	
-	Public Information	(63,607)								(63,607)	
-	Funeral Caisson	(100,205)								(100,205)	
-	Operations & Training	(24,311)								(24,311)	
<b>E24 Total</b>		<b>3,845,832</b>	<b>54,571,634</b>	<b>7,791,850</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>66,209,316</b>	<b>165.50</b>
<b>E28</b>	<b>Election Commission</b>	<b>800,258</b>		<b>440,700</b>						<b>1,240,958</b>	<b>19.50</b>

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	2012 Primary Election	-					3,625,000			3,625,000	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(20,979)								(20,979)	
-	Central Travel Office	(1,038)								(1,038)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(4,379)								(4,379)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(113)								(113)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(572)								(572)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(16,436)								(16,436)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(1,989)								(1,989)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(2,195)								(2,195)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(261)								(261)	
	<b>E28 Total</b>	<b>752,296</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>440,700</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,625,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,817,996</b>	<b>19.50</b>
<b>F03</b>	<b>Budget &amp; Control Board</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>46,400,891</b>	<b>177,247,142</b>						<b>223,648,033</b>	<b>1,241.23</b>
-	Agency Base Restoration	17,588,661					2,158,284			19,746,945	
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		(34,575,869)	(5,037,714)						(39,613,583)	
	<b>F03 Total</b>	<b>17,588,661</b>	<b>11,825,022</b>	<b>172,209,428</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,158,284</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>203,781,395</b>	<b>1,241.23</b>
<b>F27</b>	<b>Budget &amp; Control Board - Auditor</b>	<b>2,345,509</b>		<b>585,000</b>						<b>2,930,509</b>	<b>56.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			5,500						5,500	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(86,565)								(86,565)	
-	Central Travel Office	(125)								(125)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(23)								(23)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,502)								(1,502)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(18,566)								(18,566)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(1,157)								(1,157)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(3,052)								(3,052)	
	<b>F27 Total</b>	<b>2,234,519</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>590,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,825,019</b>	<b>56.00</b>
<b>F30</b>	<b>Budget &amp; Control Board - Employee Benefits</b>	<b>10,103,532</b>		<b>209,381</b>						<b>10,312,913</b>	
-	Annualization - FY10-11 Employee Health Insurance	29,119,844								29,119,844	
-	FY11-12 Employee Health Insurance Increase	43,224,000								43,224,000	
	<b>F30 Total</b>	<b>82,447,376</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>209,381</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>82,656,757</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>F31</b>	<b>Budget &amp; Control Board - Capital Reserve Fund</b>	<b>104,837,915</b>								<b>104,837,915</b>	
	<b>F31 Total</b>	<b>104,837,915</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>104,837,915</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>H03</b>	<b>Commission on Higher Education</b>	<b>118,177,399</b>	<b>6,104,990</b>	<b>8,482,597</b>		<b>195,635,169</b>				<b>328,400,155</b>	<b>41.00</b>
-	Higher Education Scholarships	2,431,062				13,044,900				15,475,962	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(46,407)								(46,407)	
-	Central Travel Office	(13,980)								(13,980)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(663)								(663)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,461)								(1,461)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(25,316)								(25,316)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(8,003)								(8,003)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(6,267)								(6,267)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(1,024)								(1,024)	
-	University Center of Greenville	(1,122,021)								(1,122,021)	
-	Lowcountry Graduate Center	(811,963)								(811,963)	
-	Arts Program Tuition Assistance	(7,422)								(7,422)	
-	Cutting Edge	(104,083)								(104,083)	
-	Higher Education Assistance	(183,003)								(183,003)	
-	African American Loan Program	(123,382)								(123,382)	
-	National Foundation of Teaching Entrepreneurship (NFTE)	(122,345)								(122,345)	
-	Charleston Transition College Connection	(185,309)								(185,309)	
	<b>H03 Total</b>	<b>117,845,812</b>	<b>6,104,990</b>	<b>8,482,597</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>208,680,069</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>341,113,468</b>	<b>41.00</b>
<b>H06</b>	<b>Higher Education Tuition Grants</b>	<b>22,009,392</b>	<b>704,226</b>	<b>5,138,141</b>		<b>7,766,604</b>				<b>35,618,363</b>	<b>5.00</b>
-	Tuition and Grants	3,000,000								3,000,000	
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	129,819	(636,526)						(506,707)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(10,080)								(10,080)	
-	Central Travel Office	(579)								(579)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(88)								(88)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(219)								(219)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(4,998)								(4,998)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(893)								(893)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(425)								(425)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(210)								(210)	
	<b>H06 Total</b>	<b>24,991,900</b>	<b>834,045</b>	<b>4,501,615</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,766,604</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>38,094,164</b>	<b>5.00</b>
<b>H09</b>	<b>The Citadel</b>	<b>8,992,401</b>	<b>22,686,504</b>	<b>97,245,298</b>						<b>128,924,203</b>	<b>648.15</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	5,406,339	(749,934)						4,656,405	
-	Base Reduction to Offset Excessive Tuition Increases	(907,379)								(907,379)	
-	Administration - 15% Reduction	(1,445,271)								(1,445,271)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(418,228)								(418,228)	
-	TERI Savings	(35,651)								(35,651)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(415,973)								(415,973)	
-	Central Travel Office	(105,888)								(105,888)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(5,075)								(5,075)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(12,339)								(12,339)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(3,429)								(3,429)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	Lobbyists	(88,800)								(88,800)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(82,642)								(82,642)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(7,949)								(7,949)	
-	Student Services	(1,110,000)								(1,110,000)	
<b>H09 Total</b>		<b>4,353,777</b>	<b>28,092,843</b>	<b>96,495,364</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>128,941,984</b>	<b>648.15</b>
<b>H12</b>	<b>Clemson University (E&amp;G)</b>	<b>62,659,849</b>	<b>80,822,647</b>	<b>624,914,362</b>						<b>768,396,858</b>	<b>3,472.48</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	8,847,597	25,772,281						34,619,878	
-	1% Collaboration - Higher Education	(620,135)								(620,135)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(1,136,963)								(1,136,963)	
-	TERI Savings	(700,227)								(700,227)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(3,013,466)								(3,013,466)	
-	Central Travel Office	(1,161,163)								(1,161,163)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(28,849)								(28,849)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(69,937)								(69,937)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(166,685)								(166,685)	
-	Lobbyists	(275,485)								(275,485)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(188,575)								(188,575)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(91,000)								(91,000)	
-	Call Me Mister	(1,300,000)								(1,300,000)	
<b>H12 Total</b>		<b>53,907,364</b>	<b>89,670,244</b>	<b>650,686,643</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>794,264,251</b>	<b>3,472.48</b>
<b>H15</b>	<b>University of Charleston</b>	<b>18,972,744</b>	<b>12,000,000</b>	<b>176,239,588</b>						<b>207,212,332</b>	<b>1,330.18</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	5,000,000	7,296,908						12,296,908	
-	Administration - 15% Reduction	(5,695,761)								(5,695,761)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(579,707)								(579,707)	
-	Administration Standards - Higher Education	(183,378)								(183,378)	
-	TERI Savings	(85,575)								(85,575)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(868,555)								(868,555)	
-	Central Travel Office	(182,887)								(182,887)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(9,038)								(9,038)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(25,637)								(25,637)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(1,136)								(1,136)	
-	Lobbyists	(86,250)								(86,250)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(101,875)								(101,875)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(8,576)								(8,576)	
-	Public Service	(31,900)								(31,900)	
-	Student Services	(1,388,572)								(1,388,572)	
<b>H15 Total</b>		<b>9,723,897</b>	<b>17,000,000</b>	<b>183,536,496</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>210,260,393</b>	<b>1,330.18</b>
<b>H17</b>	<b>Coastal Carolina University</b>	<b>9,215,957</b>	<b>9,240,000</b>	<b>127,300,000</b>						<b>145,755,957</b>	<b>1,015.08</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	4,400,000	6,900,000						11,300,000	
-	Administration - 15% Reduction	(1,587,460)								(1,587,460)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(427,560)								(427,560)	
-	TERI Savings	(78,658)								(78,658)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(415,045)								(415,045)	
-	Central Travel Office	(97,991)								(97,991)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(6,023)								(6,023)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(9,191)								(9,191)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(23,480)								(23,480)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(59,001)								(59,001)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(16,490)								(16,490)	
<b>H17 Total</b>		<b>6,495,058</b>	<b>13,640,000</b>	<b>134,200,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>154,335,058</b>	<b>1,015.08</b>
<b>H18</b>	<b>Francis Marion University</b>	<b>10,703,050</b>	<b>6,885,887</b>	<b>32,305,935</b>						<b>49,894,872</b>	<b>465.36</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	378,167	636,033						1,014,200	
-	Administration - 15% Reduction	(719,800)								(719,800)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(220,972)								(220,972)	
-	Administration Standards - Higher Education	(396,695)								(396,695)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(489,461)								(489,461)	
-	Central Travel Office	(40,212)								(40,212)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(2,350)								(2,350)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(16,718)								(16,718)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(38,039)								(38,039)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(4,759)								(4,759)	
<b>H18 Total</b>		<b>8,774,044</b>	<b>7,264,054</b>	<b>32,941,968</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>48,980,066</b>	<b>465.36</b>
<b>H21</b>	<b>Lander University</b>	<b>6,066,604</b>	<b>420,042</b>	<b>29,053,274</b>						<b>35,539,920</b>	<b>333.91</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(80,019)	4,244,862						4,164,843	
-	Administration - 15% Reduction	(514,649)								(514,649)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(100,495)								(100,495)	
-	Administration Standards - Higher Education	(330,918)								(330,918)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(266,940)								(266,940)	
-	Central Travel Office	(371)								(371)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(1,529)								(1,529)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(9,058)								(9,058)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(37,208)								(37,208)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(3,189)								(3,189)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
<b>H21 Total</b>		<b>4,802,247</b>	<b>340,023</b>	<b>33,298,136</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>38,440,406</b>	<b>333.91</b>
<b>H24</b>	<b>South Carolina State University</b>	<b>11,898,708</b>	<b>54,501,255</b>	<b>83,401,486</b>		<b>2,500,000</b>				<b>152,301,449</b>	<b>702.33</b>
-	Administration - 15% Reduction	(1,330,332)								(1,330,332)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(576,389)								(576,389)	
-	TERI Savings	(37,079)								(37,079)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(512,362)								(512,362)	
-	Central Travel Office	(123,887)								(123,887)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(7,712)								(7,712)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(20,362)								(20,362)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(13,548)								(13,548)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(33,251)								(33,251)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(24,198)								(24,198)	
-	Public Service	(250,000)								(250,000)	
-	Student Services	(1,100,250)								(1,100,250)	
<b>H24 Total</b>		<b>7,869,338</b>	<b>54,501,255</b>	<b>83,401,486</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>148,272,079</b>	<b>702.33</b>
<b>H27</b>	<b>University of South Carolina - Columbia</b>	<b>101,018,394</b>	<b>158,872,367</b>	<b>657,851,103</b>						<b>917,741,864</b>	<b>4,851.45</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	2,463,484	(15,954,175)						(13,490,691)	
-	Archeology & Anthropology Program Restructuring	(496,812)								(496,812)	
-	1% Collaboration - Higher Education	(954,143)								(954,143)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(1,876,468)								(1,876,468)	
-	TERI Savings	(552,480)								(552,480)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(4,570,443)								(4,570,443)	
-	Central Travel Office	(1,068,495)								(1,068,495)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(13,908)								(13,908)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(37,771)								(37,771)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(138,590)								(138,590)	
-	Consolidate Maintenance Facilities in Columbia	(43,200)								(43,200)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(153,252)								(153,252)	
-	Lobbyists	(221,322)								(221,322)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(390,198)								(390,198)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(69,102)								(69,102)	
-	Instruction: Graduate School and University 101	(1,276,064)								(1,276,064)	
-	Palmetto Poison Control Initiative	(176,763)								(176,763)	
<b>H27 Total</b>		<b>88,979,383</b>	<b>161,335,851</b>	<b>641,896,928</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>892,212,162</b>	<b>4,851.45</b>
<b>H29</b>	<b>University of South Carolina - Aiken</b>	<b>6,207,411</b>	<b>4,857,557</b>	<b>40,715,712</b>						<b>51,780,680</b>	<b>380.26</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	470,677	(1,047,761)						(577,084)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(114,251)								(114,251)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(285,742)								(285,742)	
-	Central Travel Office	(32,877)								(32,877)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(2,205)								(2,205)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(8,108)								(8,108)	
<b>H29 Total</b>		<b>5,764,228</b>	<b>5,328,234</b>	<b>39,667,951</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50,760,413</b>	<b>380.26</b>
<b>H34</b>	<b>University of South Carolina - Upstate</b>	<b>8,093,427</b>	<b>9,675,558</b>	<b>64,513,741</b>						<b>82,282,726</b>	<b>506.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	145,425	(510,372)						(364,947)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(246,681)								(246,681)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(373,664)								(373,664)	
-	Central Travel Office	(72,411)								(72,411)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(3,524)								(3,524)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(9,614)								(9,614)	
<b>H34 Total</b>		<b>7,387,533</b>	<b>9,820,983</b>	<b>64,003,369</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>81,211,885</b>	<b>506.00</b>
<b>H36</b>	<b>University of South Carolina - Beaufort</b>	<b>1,461,646</b>	<b>2,174,374</b>	<b>19,481,600</b>						<b>23,117,620</b>	<b>138.34</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	100,413	(873,251)						(772,838)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(75,345)								(75,345)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(66,809)								(66,809)	
-	Central Travel Office	(17,770)								(17,770)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(906)								(906)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,118)								(1,118)	
<b>H36 Total</b>		<b>1,299,698</b>	<b>2,274,787</b>	<b>18,608,349</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>22,182,834</b>	<b>138.34</b>
<b>H37</b>	<b>University of South Carolina - Lancaster</b>	<b>1,542,935</b>	<b>2,566,743</b>	<b>13,020,764</b>						<b>17,130,442</b>	<b>97.03</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	143,833	89,689						233,522	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(38,666)								(38,666)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(70,948)								(70,948)	
-	Central Travel Office	(6,539)								(6,539)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(724)								(724)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,387)								(1,387)	
<b>H37 Total</b>		<b>1,424,671</b>	<b>2,710,576</b>	<b>13,110,453</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>17,245,700</b>	<b>97.03</b>
<b>H38</b>	<b>University of South Carolina - Salkehatchie</b>	<b>1,314,759</b>	<b>2,680,429</b>	<b>7,197,292</b>						<b>11,192,480</b>	<b>57.27</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	383,653	112,696						496,349	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(42,531)								(42,531)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(56,205)								(56,205)	
-	Central Travel Office	(7,062)								(7,062)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(455)								(455)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,261)								(1,261)	



**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	Leadership Institute	(100,460)								(100,460)	
	<b>H38 Total</b>	<b>1,106,785</b>	<b>3,064,082</b>	<b>7,309,988</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>11,480,855</b>	<b>57.27</b>
<b>H39</b>	<b>University of South Carolina - Sumter</b>	<b>2,443,785</b>	<b>1,829,494</b>	<b>9,402,006</b>						<b>13,675,285</b>	<b>117.06</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-		365,416						365,416	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(22,154)								(22,154)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(111,845)								(111,845)	
-	Central Travel Office	(11,854)								(11,854)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(598)								(598)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(2,934)								(2,934)	
	<b>H39 Total</b>	<b>2,294,400</b>	<b>1,829,494</b>	<b>9,767,422</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>13,891,316</b>	<b>117.06</b>
<b>H40</b>	<b>University of South Carolina - Union</b>	<b>596,398</b>	<b>1,227,601</b>	<b>2,802,042</b>						<b>4,626,041</b>	<b>34.82</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	100,001	426,853						526,854	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(18,388)								(18,388)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(27,874)								(27,874)	
-	Central Travel Office	(716)								(716)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(196)								(196)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(916)								(916)	
	<b>H40 Total</b>	<b>548,308</b>	<b>1,327,602</b>	<b>3,228,895</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>5,104,805</b>	<b>34.82</b>
<b>H47</b>	<b>Winthrop University</b>	<b>13,011,917</b>	<b>39,974,761</b>	<b>82,606,706</b>						<b>135,593,384</b>	<b>799.03</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	8,131,820	(86,706)						8,045,114	
-	Administration - 15% Reduction	(976,144)								(976,144)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(289,314)								(289,314)	
-	TERI Savings	(14,150)								(14,150)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(595,057)								(595,057)	
-	Central Travel Office	(122,346)								(122,346)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(6,188)								(6,188)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(23,550)								(23,550)	
-	Lobbyists	(97,200)								(97,200)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(55,692)								(55,692)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(7,588)								(7,588)	
-	Student Services	(967,049)								(967,049)	
	<b>H47 Total</b>	<b>9,857,639</b>	<b>48,106,581</b>	<b>82,520,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>140,484,220</b>	<b>799.03</b>
<b>H51</b>	<b>Medical University of South Carolina</b>	<b>54,052,768</b>	<b>140,000,000</b>	<b>400,757,509</b>						<b>594,810,277</b>	<b>3,037.17</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		36,973,500	9,639,293						46,612,793	
-	Diabetes Center	(289,088)								(289,088)	
-	1% Collaboration - Higher Education	(513,199)								(513,199)	
-	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	(2,328,529)								(2,328,529)	
-	TERI Savings	(219,840)								(219,840)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(2,333,080)								(2,333,080)	
-	Central Travel Office	(508,106)								(508,106)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(659)								(659)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(26,864)								(26,864)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(86,274)								(86,274)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(82,810)								(82,810)	
-	Lobbyists	(222,771)								(222,771)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(266,924)								(266,924)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(77,598)								(77,598)	
-	Public Assistance	(3,628,209)								(3,628,209)	
-	Student Services	(1,344,649)								(1,344,649)	
-	Rural Dentist Incentive	(176,101)								(176,101)	
-	Hypertension Initiative	(240,433)								(240,433)	
	<b>H51 Total</b>	<b>41,707,634</b>	<b>176,973,500</b>	<b>410,396,802</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>629,077,936</b>	<b>3,037.17</b>
<b>H53</b>	<b>Consortium of Community Teaching Hospitals</b>	<b>8,711,377</b>	<b>801,773</b>	<b>2,537,510</b>						<b>12,050,660</b>	<b>26.32</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		421,398	(359,917)						61,481	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(201,636)								(201,636)	
-	Central Travel Office	(5,025)								(5,025)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(755)								(755)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,601)								(1,601)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(248,740)								(248,740)	
-	Health Careers Program	(221,771)								(221,771)	
-	Nursing Recruitment Center	(26,393)								(26,393)	
	<b>H53 Total</b>	<b>8,005,456</b>	<b>1,223,171</b>	<b>2,177,593</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>11,406,220</b>	<b>26.32</b>
<b>H59</b>	<b>Technical &amp; Comprehensive Education</b>	<b>106,317,224</b>	<b>37,288,585</b>	<b>402,172,409</b>						<b>545,778,218</b>	<b>4,466.39</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	18,688,849	54,566,921						73,255,770	
-	CATT Program	300,000					5,000,000			5,300,000	
-	Administration - Establish Three Regions	(22,600,000)								(22,600,000)	
-	Administration Standards - Higher Education	(2,024,394)								(2,024,394)	
-	TERI Savings	(262,000)								(262,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(3,082,882)								(3,082,882)	
-	Central Travel Office	(451,922)								(451,922)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(3,712)								(3,712)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(167,374)								(167,374)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(35,366)								(35,366)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(1,363)								(1,363)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(40,665)								(40,665)	
-	Lobbyists	(82,817)								(82,817)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(371,727)								(371,727)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(37,182)								(37,182)	
-	Florence-Darlington Entrepreneurial Operations Equipment	(310,850)								(310,850)	
-	Trident Tech - Culinary Arts	(481,817)								(481,817)	
-	Community Service Programs	(547,704)								(547,704)	
-	Florence-Darlington - SIMT	(932,549)								(932,549)	
-	Apprenticeship	(584,550)								(584,550)	
<b>H59 Total</b>		<b>74,598,350</b>	<b>55,977,434</b>	<b>456,739,330</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>592,315,114</b>	<b>4,466.39</b>
<b>H63</b>	<b>State Department of Education</b>	<b>1,856,252,486</b>	<b>705,659,402</b>	<b>36,875,638</b>	<b>522,234,107</b>	<b>49,614,527</b>				<b>3,170,636,160</b>	<b>1,060.02</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	5,877,057	(11,542,343)						(5,665,286)	
-	Charter School Districts - Infrastructure & Facility Development	1,000,000								1,000,000	
-	Charter School Districts - Virtual Curriculum	500,000								500,000	
-	Virtual Learning	1,000,000								1,000,000	
-	EEDA	1,000,000								1,000,000	
-	National Board Certification (NBC) - Funding Shifted to EIA	(19,231,405)			21,881,405					2,650,000	
-	Instructional Materials - Funding Shifted to EIA	(8,383,472)			8,383,472					-	
-	School Transportation	-			11,000,000					11,000,000	
-	Education Finance Act (EFA) Funding	83,487,640						91,646,392		175,134,032	
-	Transfer Agency Functions from ETV	4,265,830	82,461	10,629,000						14,977,291	243.20
-	Transfer Agency Functions from Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School	2,389,425	240,000	1,430,615						4,060,040	64.19
-	Transfer Agency Functions from School for Deaf & Blind	10,012,105	1,408,321	15,157,000		200,000				26,777,426	388.23
-	Transfer Agency Functions from John De La Howe	2,436,425	180,596	431,512						3,048,533	117.51
-	Finance and Operations	(344,152)								(344,152)	
-	Administration	(157,228)								(157,228)	
-	School District Consolidation	(26,000,000)								(26,000,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(1,596,799)								(1,596,799)	
-	Central Travel Office	(104,447)								(104,447)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(71,395)								(71,395)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(31,213)								(31,213)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(3,176,200)								(3,176,200)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(1,239,188)								(1,239,188)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(34,286)								(34,286)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(55,034)								(55,034)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(11,944)								(11,944)	
-	Teacher Quality - ADEPT	(1,747,818)								(1,747,818)	
-	Career and Technology Education (CATE) - Modernize Technology	(3,776,088)								(3,776,088)	
-	High Schools That Work and Making Middle Grades Work	(1,648,937)								(1,648,937)	
-	SAT Improvement	(280,714)								(280,714)	
-	Character Education Program	(176,988)								(176,988)	
-	Felton Lab	(108,736)								(108,736)	
-	Ombudsmen Services	(41,110)								(41,110)	
<b>H63 Total</b>		<b>1,894,126,757</b>	<b>713,447,837</b>	<b>52,981,422</b>	<b>563,498,984</b>	<b>49,814,527</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>91,646,392</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,365,515,919</b>	<b>1,873.15</b>
<b>H64</b>	<b>Governor's School for Arts and Humanities</b>	<b>5,293,516</b>		<b>1,004,771</b>						<b>6,298,287</b>	<b>86.34</b>
-	Library	(280,181)								(280,181)	
<b>H64 Total</b>		<b>5,013,335</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,004,771</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,018,106</b>	<b>86.34</b>
<b>H65</b>	<b>Governor's School for Math and Science</b>	<b>2,758,894</b>		<b>746,500</b>						<b>3,505,394</b>	<b>32.92</b>
-	Statewide Outreach	(415,695)								(415,695)	
<b>H65 Total</b>		<b>2,343,199</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>746,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,089,699</b>	<b>32.92</b>
<b>H67</b>	<b>Educational Television Commission</b>	<b>9,635,095</b>	<b>82,461</b>	<b>10,164,539</b>						<b>19,882,095</b>	<b>243.20</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-		464,461						464,461	
-	Agency Base Adjustment	(4,515,233)								(4,515,233)	
-	Agency Fundraising	(32,015)								(32,015)	
-	Educational Television - Local Programming	(203,460)								(203,460)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(359,512)								(359,512)	
-	Central Travel Office	(10,789)								(10,789)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(7,070)								(7,070)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(8,717)								(8,717)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(144,446)								(144,446)	
-	Consolidate Maintenance Facilities in Columbia	(17,280)								(17,280)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(10,305)								(10,305)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(15,487)								(15,487)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(11,597)								(11,597)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(5,817)								(5,817)	
-	Educational Radio	(27,537)								(27,537)	
-	Transfer Agency Functions/Oversight to Dept. of Education	(4,265,830)	(82,461)	(10,629,000)						(14,977,291)	(243.20)
<b>H67 Total</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>H71</b>	<b>Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School</b>	<b>2,538,298</b>	<b>240,000</b>	<b>1,430,615</b>						<b>4,208,913</b>	<b>64.19</b>
-	5% Salary Reduction	(80,343)								(80,343)	
-	Central Travel Office	(486)								(486)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(1,702)								(1,702)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,969)								(1,969)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(47,314)								(47,314)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(9,048)								(9,048)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(784)								(784)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(6,691)								(6,691)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(536)								(536)	
-	Transfer Agency Functions/Oversight to Dept. of Education	(2,389,425)	(240,000)	(1,430,615)						(4,060,040)	(64.19)
<b>H71 Total</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>H73</b>	<b>Vocational Rehabilitation</b>	<b>9,021,214</b>	<b>101,365,635</b>	<b>26,043,799</b>						<b>136,430,648</b>	<b>1,271.27</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(6,043,665)	(810,363)						(6,854,028)	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(590,663)								(590,663)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(395,625)								(395,625)	
-	Central Travel Office	(75,356)								(75,356)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(21,061)								(21,061)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(8,462)								(8,462)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(489,430)								(489,430)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(69,241)								(69,241)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(8,867)								(8,867)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(47,046)								(47,046)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(4,686)								(4,686)	
<b>H73 Total</b>		<b>7,310,777</b>	<b>95,321,970</b>	<b>25,233,436</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>127,866,183</b>	<b>1,271.27</b>
<b>H75</b>	<b>School for the Deaf &amp; the Blind</b>	<b>11,463,580</b>	<b>1,439,340</b>	<b>16,556,956</b>		<b>200,000</b>				<b>29,659,876</b>	<b>387.65</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(31,019)	(1,399,956)						(1,430,975)	
-	Statewide Service Delivery (formerly Outreach)	(814,734)								(814,734)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(361,797)								(361,797)	
-	Central Travel Office	(8,773)								(8,773)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(4,528)								(4,528)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(12,421)								(12,421)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(187,390)								(187,390)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(17,289)								(17,289)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(8,500)								(8,500)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(34,076)								(34,076)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(1,967)								(1,967)	
-	Transfer Agency Functions/Oversight to Dept. of Education	(10,012,105)	(1,408,321)	(15,157,000)		(200,000)				(26,777,426)	(388.23)
<b>H75 Total</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>(0.58)</b>
<b>H79</b>	<b>Department of Archives &amp; History</b>	<b>2,317,444</b>	<b>1,633,612</b>	<b>1,438,158</b>						<b>5,389,214</b>	<b>71.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(96,586)							(96,586)	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(163,134)								(163,134)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(56,272)								(56,272)	
-	Central Travel Office	(2,683)								(2,683)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(59,154)								(59,154)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(628)								(628)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(2,580)								(2,580)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(30,292)								(30,292)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(2,304)								(2,304)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(3,264)								(3,264)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(1,211)								(1,211)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(67)								(67)	
<b>H79 Total</b>		<b>1,995,855</b>	<b>1,537,026</b>	<b>1,438,158</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>4,971,039</b>	<b>71.00</b>
<b>H87</b>	<b>State Library</b>	<b>8,293,518</b>	<b>2,633,725</b>	<b>30,000</b>						<b>10,957,243</b>	<b>50.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	74,141	83,000						157,141	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(90,472)								(90,472)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(45,507)								(45,507)	
-	Central Travel Office	(3,851)								(3,851)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(60,194)								(60,194)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(456)								(456)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(930)								(930)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(31,970)								(31,970)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(598)								(598)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(4,156)								(4,156)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(35)								(35)	
<b>H87 Total</b>		<b>8,055,349</b>	<b>2,707,866</b>	<b>113,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>10,876,215</b>	<b>50.00</b>
<b>H91</b>	<b>Arts Commission</b>	<b>2,050,846</b>	<b>969,000</b>	<b>344,673</b>						<b>3,364,519</b>	<b>38.56</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	454,594	(90,496)						364,098	
-	Arts Education	(506,459)								(506,459)	
-	Community Arts Development	(929,945)								(929,945)	
-	Artist Development	(123,214)								(123,214)	
-	Administration	(491,228)								(491,228)	
<b>H91 Total</b>		-	<b>1,423,594</b>	<b>254,177</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>1,677,771</b>	<b>38.56</b>
<b>H95</b>	<b>State Museum</b>	<b>2,795,363</b>		<b>1,668,500</b>						<b>4,463,863</b>	<b>40.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-		130,000						130,000	
-	Collections	(450,463)								(450,463)	
-	Education	(637,200)								(637,200)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	Exhibits	(692,761)								(692,761)	
-	Operations	(231,088)								(231,088)	
-	Facilities	(185,391)								(185,391)	
-	Administration	(598,460)								(598,460)	
<b>H95 Total</b>		-	-	1,798,500	-	-	-	-	-	1,798,500	40.00
<b>J02</b>	<b>Health &amp; Human Services Finance Commission</b>	<b>724,885,354</b>	<b>4,276,271,339</b>	<b>763,689,143</b>						<b>5,764,845,836</b>	<b>1,196.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(402,693,429)							(402,693,429)	
-	Medicaid Maintenance of Effort	307,220,245	1,218,500,000	119,750,233			10,000,000	115,595,954		1,771,066,432	
-	Automated Claims Processing	4,411,692	39,705,233							44,116,925	
-	Medicaid Fraud & Abuse	350,000								350,000	
-	TERI Savings	(420)								(420)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(858,784)								(858,784)	
-	Central Travel Office	(55,734)								(55,734)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(12,847)								(12,847)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(22,418)								(22,418)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(1,296,282)								(1,296,282)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(21,126)								(21,126)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(46,331)								(46,331)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(13,510)								(13,510)	
-	Family Planning Services Administration	(42,081)								(42,081)	
<b>J02 Total</b>		<b>1,034,497,758</b>	<b>5,131,783,143</b>	<b>883,439,376</b>	-	-	10,000,000	115,595,954	-	<b>7,175,316,231</b>	<b>1,196.00</b>
<b>J04</b>	<b>Department of Health &amp; Environmental Control</b>	<b>82,556,547</b>	<b>278,457,807</b>	<b>204,127,757</b>						<b>565,142,111</b>	<b>4,710.23</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(5,884,161)	(12,923,047)						(18,807,208)	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(5,797,236)								(5,797,236)	
-	Increase Collections Rate by 10%	(180,000)								(180,000)	
-	TERI Savings	(216,104)								(216,104)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(2,460,811)								(2,460,811)	
-	Central Travel Office	(592,855)								(592,855)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(260,528)								(260,528)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(264,208)								(264,208)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(75,850)								(75,850)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(2,319,198)								(2,319,198)	
-	Consolidate Maintenance Facilities in Columbia	(46,080)								(46,080)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(186,569)								(186,569)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(116,520)								(116,520)	
-	Lobbyists	(107,463)								(107,463)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(255,409)								(255,409)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(47,872)								(47,872)	
-	Palmetto AIDS Life Support	(26,882)								(26,882)	
-	Emergency Medical Services	(890,526)								(890,526)	
<b>J04 Total</b>		<b>68,712,436</b>	<b>272,573,646</b>	<b>191,204,710</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>532,490,792</b>	<b>4,710.23</b>
<b>J12</b>	<b>Department of Mental Health</b>	<b>138,932,635</b>	<b>10,408,193</b>	<b>183,668,498</b>						<b>333,009,326</b>	<b>5,557.46</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	9,889,549	36,326,660						46,216,209	
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	-					9,500,000			9,500,000	
-	Agency Operating Funds	-					3,000,000			3,000,000	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(5,262,488)								(5,262,488)	
-	Increase Collections Rate by 10%	(840,000)								(840,000)	
-	TERI Savings	(138,848)								(138,848)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(4,560,336)								(4,560,336)	
-	Central Travel Office	(40,037)								(40,037)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(129,863)								(129,863)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(122,138)								(122,138)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(2,116,608)								(2,116,608)	
-	Consolidate Maintenance Facilities in Columbia	(69,696)								(69,696)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(69,412)								(69,412)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(47,001)								(47,001)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(186,375)								(186,375)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(37,005)								(37,005)	
<b>J12 Total</b>		<b>125,312,828</b>	<b>20,297,742</b>	<b>219,995,158</b>	-	-	12,500,000	-	-	<b>378,105,728</b>	<b>5,557.46</b>
<b>J16</b>	<b>Department of Disabilities and Special Needs</b>	<b>131,795,610</b>	<b>340,000</b>	<b>396,685,908</b>						<b>528,821,518</b>	<b>2,444.40</b>
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	4,550,863					35,834,628			40,385,491	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(1,938,303)								(1,938,303)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(2,357,984)								(2,357,984)	
-	Central Travel Office	(3,528)								(3,528)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(2,462)								(2,462)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(188,018)								(188,018)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(751,600)								(751,600)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(6,599)								(6,599)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(93,451)								(93,451)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(4,792)								(4,792)	
<b>J16 Total</b>		<b>130,999,736</b>	<b>340,000</b>	<b>396,685,908</b>	-	-	35,834,628	-	-	<b>563,860,272</b>	<b>2,444.40</b>
<b>J20</b>	<b>Department of Alcohol &amp; Other Drug Abuse Services</b>	<b>6,540,829</b>	<b>25,790,952</b>	<b>1,911,632</b>						<b>34,243,413</b>	<b>33.81</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(1,225,228)	(173,632)						(1,398,860)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration	(208,737)								(208,737)	
	<b>J20 Total</b>	<b>6,332,092</b>	<b>24,565,724</b>	<b>1,738,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>32,635,816</b>	<b>33.81</b>
<b>K05</b>	<b>Department of Public Safety</b>	<b>66,411,155</b>	<b>71,467,547</b>	<b>39,342,844</b>						<b>177,221,546</b>	<b>1,724.50</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(30,979,201)	5,414,275						(25,564,926)	
-	Additional Law Enforcement Officers	5,556,500					4,550,863			10,107,363	
-	Highway and Traffic Enforcement	(694,332)								(694,332)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(2,466,577)								(2,466,577)	
-	Central Travel Office	(18,092)								(18,092)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(1,087)								(1,087)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(159,258)								(159,258)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(57,593)								(57,593)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(797,240)								(797,240)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(754,925)								(754,925)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(3,798)								(3,798)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(113,267)								(113,267)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(22,692)								(22,692)	
	<b>K05 Total</b>	<b>66,878,794</b>	<b>40,488,346</b>	<b>44,757,119</b>	-	-	<b>4,550,863</b>	-	-	<b>156,675,122</b>	<b>1,724.50</b>
<b>L04</b>	<b>Department of Social Services</b>	<b>119,276,495</b>	<b>1,458,334,168</b>	<b>121,549,950</b>						<b>1,699,160,613</b>	<b>3,954.79</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	477,805,727	(28,217,014)						449,588,713	
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	39,223,301					19,437,680		501,948	59,162,929	
-	Pass Thru Funds	(1,093,944)								(1,093,944)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(1,889,812)								(1,889,812)	
-	Central Travel Office	(71,957)								(71,957)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(119,851)								(119,851)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(30,223)								(30,223)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(65,751)								(65,751)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(1,037,356)								(1,037,356)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(48,946)								(48,946)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(163,577)								(163,577)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(22,346)								(22,346)	
	<b>L04 Total</b>	<b>153,956,033</b>	<b>1,936,139,895</b>	<b>93,332,936</b>	-	-	<b>19,437,680</b>	-	<b>501,948</b>	<b>2,203,368,492</b>	<b>3,954.79</b>
<b>L12</b>	<b>John de la Howe School</b>	<b>2,891,590</b>	<b>180,596</b>	<b>995,246</b>						<b>4,067,432</b>	<b>117.51</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			(563,734)						(563,734)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(97,021)								(97,021)	
-	Central Travel Office	(272)								(272)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(488)								(488)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(2,949)								(2,949)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(39,534)								(39,534)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(443)								(443)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(8,211)								(8,211)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(59)								(59)	
-	Therapeutic Wilderness Camping	(306,188)								(306,188)	
-	Transfer Agency Functions/Oversight to Dept. of Education	(2,436,425)	(180,596)	(431,512)						(3,048,533)	(117.51)
	<b>L12 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>L24</b>	<b>Commission for the Blind</b>	<b>2,229,761</b>	<b>8,291,325</b>	<b>193,000</b>						<b>10,714,086</b>	<b>136.85</b>
-	Administration - Restructuring	(194,183)								(194,183)	
-	Vocational Rehabilitation Services	(150,000)								(150,000)	
-	TERI Savings	(2,337)								(2,337)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(76,902)								(76,902)	
-	Central Travel Office	(2,528)								(2,528)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(3,153)								(3,153)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(2,009)								(2,009)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(163,362)								(163,362)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(1,021)								(1,021)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(7,777)								(7,777)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(1,913)								(1,913)	
	<b>L24 Total</b>	<b>1,624,576</b>	<b>8,291,325</b>	<b>193,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>10,108,901</b>	<b>136.85</b>
<b>L32</b>	<b>Housing Finance and Development Authority</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>232,761,870</b>	<b>23,669,330</b>						<b>256,431,200</b>	<b>133.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		(78,900,842)	(767,131)						(79,667,973)	
	<b>L32 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>153,861,028</b>	<b>22,902,199</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>176,763,227</b>	<b>133.00</b>
<b>L36</b>	<b>Human Affairs Commission</b>	<b>648,731</b>	<b>177,528</b>	<b>723,500</b>						<b>1,549,759</b>	<b>47.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			(312,400)						(312,400)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(19,192)								(19,192)	
-	Central Travel Office	(818)								(818)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(225)								(225)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(14,120)								(14,120)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(44)								(44)	
-	Transfer Agency Functions/Oversight to Attorney General	(614,332)	(177,528)	(411,100)						(1,202,960)	(47.00)
	<b>L36 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>L46</b>	<b>Commission on Minority Affairs</b>	<b>398,631</b>		<b>331,000</b>						<b>729,631</b>	<b>10.00</b>
-	Administration (Overhead Costs)	(102,058)								(102,058)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(17,001)								(17,001)	
-	Central Travel Office	(351)								(351)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(146)								(146)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(263)								(263)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(6,082)								(6,082)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(1,352)								(1,352)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(2,144)								(2,144)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(123)								(123)	
-	Research	(77,953)								(77,953)	
-	Transfer Agency Functions/Oversight to Gov. Office-OEPP	(191,158)		(331,000)						(522,158)	(10.00)
<b>L46 Total</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>N04</b>	<b>Department of Corrections</b>	<b>296,393,732</b>	<b>3,187,726</b>	<b>52,644,160</b>						<b>352,225,618</b>	<b>6,283.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	902,021	1,502,340						2,404,361	
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	57,788,397								57,788,397	
-	Maintenance	-					1,000,000			1,000,000	
-	Perimeter Security	-					1,000,000			1,000,000	
-	Addictions Treatment	-					1,000,000			1,000,000	
-	Vehicle Maintenance	(500,000)								(500,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(9,454,770)								(9,454,770)	
-	Central Travel Office	(4,271)								(4,271)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(102,754)								(102,754)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(255,894)								(255,894)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(1,767,502)								(1,767,502)	
-	Consolidate Maintenance Facilities in Columbia	(160,704)								(160,704)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(68,042)								(68,042)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(443)								(443)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(326,717)								(326,717)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(19,089)								(19,089)	
<b>N04 Total</b>		<b>341,521,943</b>	<b>4,089,747</b>	<b>54,146,500</b>	-	-	<b>3,000,000</b>	-	-	<b>402,758,190</b>	<b>6,283.00</b>
<b>N08</b>	<b>Department of Probation, Parole &amp; Pardon Services</b>	<b>18,940,635</b>	<b>2,015,000</b>	<b>27,768,951</b>						<b>48,724,586</b>	<b>852.00</b>
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	1,825,870					3,177,000			5,002,870	
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(1,765,000)	3,404,541						1,639,541	
-	Parole Board Support	(144,119)								(144,119)	
-	Parole Board	(59,928)								(59,928)	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(2,000,000)								(2,000,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(778,442)								(778,442)	
-	Central Travel Office	(7,341)								(7,341)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(32,676)								(32,676)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(7,105)								(7,105)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(18,009)								(18,009)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(234,864)								(234,864)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(14,221)								(14,221)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(57,053)								(57,053)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(33,426)								(33,426)	
<b>N08 Total</b>		<b>17,379,321</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>31,173,492</b>	-	-	<b>3,177,000</b>	-	-	<b>51,979,813</b>	<b>852.00</b>
<b>N12</b>	<b>Department of Juvenile Justice</b>	<b>89,478,058</b>	<b>4,026,449</b>	<b>20,170,395</b>						<b>113,674,902</b>	<b>1,836.11</b>
-	Annualization - Agency Operating Funds	1,000,000					1,000,000			2,000,000	
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(318,952)							(318,952)	
-	Parole Board	(220,953)								(220,953)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(2,084,459)								(2,084,459)	
-	Central Travel Office	(4,827)								(4,827)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(14,007)								(14,007)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(57,466)								(57,466)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(814,012)								(814,012)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(19,455)								(19,455)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(10,394)								(10,394)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(105,997)								(105,997)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(13,622)								(13,622)	
<b>N12 Total</b>		<b>87,132,866</b>	<b>3,707,497</b>	<b>20,170,395</b>	-	-	<b>1,000,000</b>	-	-	<b>112,010,758</b>	<b>1,836.11</b>
<b>N20</b>	<b>Law Enforcement Training Council</b>	<b>635,666</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>12,536,250</b>						<b>14,171,916</b>	<b>113.25</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-		(300,250)						(300,250)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(22,068)								(22,068)	
-	Central Travel Office	(5,654)								(5,654)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(6,840)								(6,840)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(290)								(290)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(23,898)								(23,898)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(2,502)								(2,502)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(11,072)								(11,072)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(1,785)								(1,785)	
<b>N20 Total</b>		<b>561,557</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>12,236,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>13,797,557</b>	<b>113.25</b>
<b>P12</b>	<b>Forestry Commission</b>	<b>9,878,203</b>	<b>6,106,745</b>	<b>6,618,000</b>						<b>22,602,948</b>	<b>410.30</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	(1,180,898)	658,000						(522,898)	
-	Wildland Firefighting	1,000,000								1,000,000	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(395,297)								(395,297)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(329,125)								(329,125)	

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	Central Travel Office	(20,627)								(20,627)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(4,857)								(4,857)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(15,444)								(15,444)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(191,816)								(191,816)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(74,853)								(74,853)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(11,323)								(11,323)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(26,149)								(26,149)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(9,860)								(9,860)	
-	Enforcement - Timber Theft and Fraud	(201,356)								(201,356)	
-	Forest Management Assistance	(1,196,254)								(1,196,254)	
-	Forest Renewal Program Financial Assistance	(200,000)								(200,000)	
-	Outreach	(50,497)								(50,497)	
<b>P12 Total</b>		<b>8,150,745</b>	<b>4,925,847</b>	<b>7,276,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20,352,592</b>	<b>410.30</b>
<b>P16</b>	<b>Department of Agriculture</b>	<b>3,104,823</b>	<b>322,168</b>	<b>11,453,193</b>						<b>14,880,184</b>	<b>151.56</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-		(2,741,562)						(2,741,562)	
-	Consumer Services	(223,047)								(223,047)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(111,106)								(111,106)	
-	Central Travel Office	(19,564)								(19,564)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(9,551)								(9,551)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(1,518)								(1,518)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(2,855)								(2,855)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(146,458)								(146,458)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(3,680)								(3,680)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(23,620)								(23,620)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(10,744)								(10,744)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(1,906)								(1,906)	
-	Marketing and Promotions	(722,932)								(722,932)	
<b>P16 Total</b>		<b>1,827,842</b>	<b>322,168</b>	<b>8,711,631</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,861,641</b>	<b>151.56</b>
<b>P20</b>	<b>Clemson PSA</b>	<b>28,470,956</b>	<b>14,014,661</b>	<b>20,591,254</b>						<b>63,076,871</b>	<b>867.95</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	70,825							70,825	
-	Administration	(75,000)								(75,000)	
-	Livestock-Poultry Health Programs: Meat Inspection	(474,836)								(474,836)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(1,148,464)								(1,148,464)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(29,158)								(29,158)	
-	Television, Web, and Print Productions	(800,545)								(800,545)	
-	Horticultural Crops	(3,076,637)								(3,076,637)	
-	Rural Community Leadership Development	(61,295)								(61,295)	
-	Natural Resources and Environmental Research and Education	(1,139,312)								(1,139,312)	
-	Natural Resources and Environmental Research and Education	(775,063)								(775,063)	
-	Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems: Nutraceutical Crops	(79,578)								(79,578)	
-	Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems: Organic Crops	(129,427)								(129,427)	
-	Reducing the Impact of Animal Agriculture on the Environment	(211,591)								(211,591)	
-	Agricultural Biotechnology	(1,913,103)								(1,913,103)	
-	Risk Management Systems for Agricultural Firms	(520,404)								(520,404)	
-	Integrated Pest Management (IPM) for Agriculture and Forestry	(836,355)								(836,355)	
-	Sustainable Forestry	(1,272,167)								(1,272,167)	
-	Rural Community Economic Development	(97,565)								(97,565)	
-	Regulatory and Public Service Programs: Pesticide Regulation	(125,531)								(125,531)	
-	4-H and Agricultural & Natural Resource Programs for Youth	(2,518,974)								(2,518,974)	
-	Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems	(2,824,341)								(2,824,341)	
-	Pesticide Applicator Licenses	(301,232)								(301,232)	
<b>P20 Total</b>		<b>10,060,378</b>	<b>14,085,486</b>	<b>20,591,254</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>44,737,118</b>	<b>867.95</b>
<b>P21</b>	<b>South Carolina State PSA</b>	<b>2,076,870</b>	<b>3,724,327</b>							<b>5,801,197</b>	<b>55.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		231,434							231,434	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(29,406)								(29,406)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(461)								(461)	
-	Sustainable Agriculture	(545,214)								(545,214)	
-	Nutrition, Education, Diet and Health	(272,607)								(272,607)	
-	Community Leadership and Economic Development	(272,607)								(272,607)	
<b>P21 Total</b>		<b>956,575</b>	<b>3,955,761</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,912,336</b>	<b>55.00</b>
<b>P24</b>	<b>Department of Natural Resources</b>	<b>14,814,081</b>	<b>27,417,107</b>	<b>45,027,922</b>						<b>87,259,110</b>	<b>850.20</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	8,335,360	(6,745,580)						1,589,780	
-	Administration - Restructuring	(762,726)								(762,726)	
-	Provide Public Information	(70,000)								(70,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(520,614)								(520,614)	
-	Central Travel Office	(24,701)								(24,701)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(38,748)								(38,748)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(26,788)								(26,788)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(16,504)								(16,504)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(544,532)								(544,532)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(244,886)								(244,886)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(7,492)								(7,492)	
-	Lobbyists	(82,459)								(82,459)	



**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(18,830)								(18,830)	
-	Outreach and Education Services	(250,950)								(250,950)	
	<b>P24 Total</b>	<b>12,204,851</b>	<b>35,752,467</b>	<b>38,282,342</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>86,239,660</b>	<b>850.20</b>
<b>P26</b>	<b>Sea Grant Consortium</b>	<b>363,769</b>	<b>5,820,000</b>	<b>282,500</b>						<b>6,466,269</b>	<b>14.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		500,000							500,000	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(11,666)								(11,666)	
-	Central Travel Office	(12,295)								(12,295)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(299)								(299)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(553)								(553)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(16,044)								(16,044)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(975)								(975)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(1,132)								(1,132)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(167)								(167)	
	<b>P26 Total</b>	<b>320,638</b>	<b>6,320,000</b>	<b>282,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,923,138</b>	<b>14.00</b>
<b>P28</b>	<b>Department of Parks, Recreation &amp; Tourism</b>	<b>18,359,104</b>	<b>4,659,110</b>	<b>37,397,504</b>						<b>60,415,718</b>	<b>494.67</b>
-	5% Salary Reduction	(297,340)								(297,340)	
-	Central Travel Office	(51,665)								(51,665)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(18,806)								(18,806)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(3,580)								(3,580)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(17,051)								(17,051)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(415,918)								(415,918)	
-	Fleet Bid Structure	(39,572)								(39,572)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(43,030)								(43,030)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(27,770)								(27,770)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(6,547)								(6,547)	
-	Interpretive & Resource Management	(220,177)								(220,177)	
-	Recreation & Grants	(315,063)								(315,063)	
-	Regional Promotions	(1,375,000)								(1,375,000)	
	<b>P28 Total</b>	<b>15,527,585</b>	<b>4,659,110</b>	<b>37,397,504</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>57,584,199</b>	<b>494.67</b>
<b>P32</b>	<b>Department of Commerce</b>	<b>3,931,890</b>	<b>30,719,000</b>	<b>42,449,000</b>						<b>77,099,890</b>	<b>115.10</b>
-	Agency Operating Funds	1,000,000								1,000,000	
-	Deal Closing Fund	-					5,000,000			5,000,000	
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		109,000	(287,000)						(178,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(108,499)								(108,499)	
-	Central Travel Office	(24,043)								(24,043)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(2,412)								(2,412)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(3,442)								(3,442)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(85,624)								(85,624)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(16,948)								(16,948)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(25,483)								(25,483)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(9,477)								(9,477)	
	<b>P32 Total</b>	<b>4,655,962</b>	<b>30,828,000</b>	<b>42,162,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>82,645,962</b>	<b>115.10</b>
<b>P34</b>	<b>Jobs - Economic Development Authority</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>269,650</b>	<b>138,000</b>						<b>407,650</b>	<b>1.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		(205,650)	182,000						(23,650)	
	<b>P34 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>64,000</b>	<b>320,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>384,000</b>	<b>1.00</b>
<b>P36</b>	<b>Patriots Point Development Authority</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,344,637</b>						<b>8,344,637</b>	<b>80.00</b>
	<b>P36 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,344,637</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,344,637</b>	<b>80.00</b>
<b>P40</b>	<b>SC Conservation Bank</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>						<b>-</b>	<b>2.00</b>
-	Funding from Documentary Stamp Tax	7,887,460								7,887,460	
	<b>P40 Total</b>	<b>7,887,460</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,887,460</b>	<b>2.00</b>
<b>R04</b>	<b>Public Service Commission</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>432,091</b>	<b>4,399,308</b>						<b>4,831,399</b>	<b>38.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		(39,091)							(39,091)	
	<b>R04 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>393,000</b>	<b>4,399,308</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,792,308</b>	<b>38.00</b>
<b>R06</b>	<b>South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,484,759</b>						<b>11,484,759</b>	<b>74.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			(365,953)						(365,953)	
	<b>R06 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,118,806</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,118,806</b>	<b>74.00</b>
<b>R08</b>	<b>Workers' Compensation Commission</b>	<b>1,936,745</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,700,000</b>						<b>4,636,745</b>	<b>65.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			418,815						418,815	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(38,478)								(38,478)	
-	Central Travel Office	(6,977)								(6,977)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(119)								(119)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(1,707)								(1,707)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(22,210)								(22,210)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(2,221)								(2,221)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(4,396)								(4,396)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(89)								(89)	
	<b>R08 Total</b>	<b>1,860,548</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,118,815</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,979,363</b>	<b>65.00</b>
<b>R12</b>	<b>State Accident Fund</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,689,521</b>						<b>6,689,521</b>	<b>86.00</b>
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			(17,000)						(17,000)	
	<b>R12 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,672,521</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,672,521</b>	<b>86.00</b>
<b>R14</b>	<b>Patient's Compensation Fund</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,014,378</b>						<b>1,014,378</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>R14 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,014,378</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,014,378</b>	<b>5.00</b>



**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
<b>R16</b>	<b>Second Injury Fund</b>	-		1,814,702						1,814,702	23.00
	<b>R16 Total</b>	-	-	1,814,702	-	-	-	-	-	1,814,702	23.00
<b>R20</b>	<b>Department of Insurance</b>	1,973,944		9,739,765						11,713,709	98.00
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			(200,000)						(200,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(74,617)								(74,617)	
-	Central Travel Office	(21,762)								(21,762)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(1,275)								(1,275)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(2,580)								(2,580)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(44,004)								(44,004)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(13,916)								(13,916)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(4,817)								(4,817)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(2,275)								(2,275)	
	<b>R20 Total</b>	1,808,698	-	9,539,765	-	-	-	-	-	11,348,463	98.00
<b>R23</b>	<b>Board of Financial Institutions</b>	-		4,069,075						4,069,075	46.00
	<b>R23 Total</b>	-	-	4,069,075	-	-	-	-	-	4,069,075	46.00
<b>R28</b>	<b>Department of Consumer Affairs</b>	628,607	67,500	2,369,250						3,065,357	64.00
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		(67,500)	(444,955)						(512,455)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(11,840)								(11,840)	
-	Central Travel Office	(3,887)								(3,887)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(192)								(192)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(15,306)								(15,306)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(1,267)								(1,267)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(770)								(770)	
-	Transfer Agency Functions/Oversight to Attorney General	(595,345)		(1,924,295)						(2,519,640)	(65.00)
	<b>R28 Total</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(1.00)
<b>R36</b>	<b>Department of Labor, Licensing &amp; Regulation</b>	1,363,988	3,047,006	36,771,797						41,182,791	413.91
-	Illegal Immigration	2,000,000								2,000,000	
-	OSHA	313,946								313,946	
-	TERI Savings	(4,614)								(4,614)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(53,665)								(53,665)	
-	Central Travel Office	(162,835)								(162,835)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(28,922)								(28,922)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(2,169)								(2,169)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(237,196)								(237,196)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(75,596)								(75,596)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(25,911)								(25,911)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(10,528)								(10,528)	
	<b>R36 Total</b>	3,076,498	3,047,006	36,771,797	-	-	-	-	-	42,895,301	413.91
<b>R40</b>	<b>Department of Motor Vehicles</b>	-	478,000	83,067,098						83,545,098	1,415.00
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		972,000							972,000	
	<b>R40 Total</b>	-	1,450,000	83,067,098	-	-	-	-	-	84,517,098	1,415.00
<b>R44</b>	<b>Department of Revenue</b>	41,241,637		21,879,093						63,120,730	762.50
-	Lease Savings	(455,579)								(455,579)	
-	TERI Savings	(10,868)								(10,868)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(1,620,453)								(1,620,453)	
-	Central Travel Office	(92,923)								(92,923)	
-	Nightly Custodial Services	(74,312)								(74,312)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(8,523)								(8,523)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(31,579)								(31,579)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(185,624)								(185,624)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(72,262)								(72,262)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(30,314)								(30,314)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(23,106)								(23,106)	
	<b>R44 Total</b>	38,636,094	-	21,879,093	-	-	-	-	-	60,515,187	762.50
<b>R52</b>	<b>State Ethics Commission</b>	257,583		367,508						625,091	10.00
-	5% Salary Reduction	(10,254)								(10,254)	
-	Central Travel Office	(207)								(207)	
-	MMO and ITMO Fees	(160)								(160)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(345)								(345)	
-	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	(3,220)								(3,220)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(399)								(399)	
-	Insurance Reserve Fund Reduction	(1,143)								(1,143)	
-	Cell Phone/Pager Use	(82)								(82)	
	<b>R52 Total</b>	241,773	-	367,508	-	-	-	-	-	609,281	10.00
<b>R60</b>	<b>Department of Employment and Workforce</b>	433,307	185,043,566	36,564,416						222,041,289	998.27
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments		1,135,117	(22,773,453)						(21,638,336)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(436)								(436)	
-	SC Occupational Information	(429,716)								(429,716)	
	<b>R60 Total</b>	3,155	186,178,683	13,790,963	-	-	-	-	-	199,972,801	998.27
<b>S60</b>	<b>Procurement Review Panel</b>	111,012		3,000						114,012	2.00
-	Administration	(23,512)								(23,512)	
-	Hearings	(87,500)								(87,500)	
	<b>S60 Total</b>	-	-	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	3,000	2.00

**FY 2011-12 Governor's Purchase Plan**

Agency Number	Agency Name	Adjusted General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	EIA	Lottery	Capital Reserve Fund	Non-Recurring Provisos	Part III (ARRA Funding)	Total Funds	Total FTEs
U12	Department of Transportation	57,270		1,289,245,000						1,289,302,270	5,407.96
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			(151,891,248)						(151,891,248)	
	<b>U12 Total</b>	<b>57,270</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,137,353,752</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,137,411,022</b>	<b>5,407.96</b>
U15	Infrastructure Bank Board	-		80,306,650						80,306,650	-
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			(29,999,250)						(29,999,250)	
	<b>U15 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50,307,400</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50,307,400</b>	<b>-</b>
U20	County Transportation Fund	-		86,000,000						86,000,000	-
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments			6,000,000						6,000,000	
	<b>U20 Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>92,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>92,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>
U30	Aeronautics Division	570,312	75,000	3,429,638						4,074,950	14.00
-	Federal & Other Fund Adjustments	-	2,325,000	642,370						2,967,370	
-	Aeronautics - Airport Development	(360,000)								(360,000)	
-	5% Salary Reduction	(20,697)								(20,697)	
-	Central Travel Office	(1,718)								(1,718)	
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(383)								(383)	
-	15% Travel Reduction	(952)								(952)	
	<b>U30 Total</b>	<b>186,562</b>	<b>2,400,000</b>	<b>4,072,008</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,658,570</b>	<b>14.00</b>
V04	Debt Service	199,210,870								199,210,870	-
	<b>V04 Total</b>	<b>199,210,870</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>199,210,870</b>	<b>-</b>
X22	Aid to Subdivisions - Treasurer	221,612,259								221,612,259	-
-	State Health Plan Savings (Maintenance Medication)	(3,065)								(3,065)	
	<b>X22 Total</b>	<b>221,609,194</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>221,609,194</b>	<b>-</b>
X44	Aid to Subdivisions - Department of Revenue	72,783,165								72,783,165	-
	<b>X44 Total</b>	<b>72,783,165</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>72,783,165</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5,377,365,805</b>	<b>9,606,854,755</b>	<b>6,976,950,797</b>	<b>563,498,984</b>	<b>268,761,200</b>	<b>110,883,455</b>	<b>209,242,346</b>	<b>501,948</b>	<b>23,114,059,290</b>	<b>71,712.43</b>

# Executive Budget Savings Plan

## Improve our K-12 Student Performance

Activity Number		Agency Name	Activity Name	Rationale	Savings Amount
<b>SAVINGS PROPOSALS</b>					
797	H63	State Department of Education	Finance	The Finance and Operations Office provides financial, procurement, and human resources support for the State Department of Education. We believe this function can be performed at lower costs. Carry forward funds should be available to offset any reductions.	344,152
798	H63	State Department of Education	Administration	This is a worthwhile yet lower priority function. We believe that this office can carry out its duties with reduced funds. Numerous other agencies carry out executive, legal, and public information duties with substantially fewer than 30 full-time staff members. We recommend reducing funds in this area and redirecting the savings to classrooms.	157,228
	H63	State Department of Education	School Districts Consolidation	We have long advocated for school district consolidation. In 2003, the EOC released a report stating that, if districts would consolidate to reach a minimum population of 2,500 students, then S.C. could save nearly \$26 million in administrative costs. Forcing taxpayers in counties that meet this standard to pay for multiple school districts in counties that do not meet this standard is not fair. We recommend reducing funding by \$26 million in FY 2011-12.	26,000,000
824	H67	Educational Television Commission	Agency Fundraising	This funding goes toward agency fundraising to support ETV's programming services, and is a worthwhile program. We recommend reducing funding for this activity because we believe that the Commission can raise funds effectively without these general funds.	32,015
854	H75	School for the Deaf & the Blind	Statewide Service Delivery (formerly Outreach)	These funds support training for parents with a child who has a vision or hearing disability, and supports school districts, state agencies, and other public entities as they comply with federal mandates such as the ADA. This is a worthwhile function that falls outside the school's core mission. In lean budget years, funding should be focused on providing educational, residential, and vocational services to the school's K-12 and adult students.	814,734
				<b>Cost Savings Subtotal</b>	27,348,129
<b>Making Tough Choices - Below the Line Savings</b>					
693	H63	State Department of Education	Teacher Quality - ADEPT	This is an ineffective professional development program that is not tied directly to raising student achievement. Additionally, the professional development offered by the ADEPT program is duplicative of other professional development models such as the Teacher Advancement Program—which is supported predominately by federal grants.	1,747,818
698	H63	State Department of Education	Career and Technology Education (CATE)- Modernize Technology	This program is a pass-through that provides Career and Technology Education equipment for school districts and Area Career Centers. While preparing students to enter the job market is an important function of our education system, we should delay providing new equipment until the budget situation improves.	3,776,088
700	H63	State Department of Education	High Schools That Work and Making Middle Grades Work	High Schools That Work and Making Middle Grades Work are non-mandatory school assessment tools that examine whether students are prepared for the next level of education. Like last year, we recommend cutting funding for these programs because South Carolina has several other school-assessment programs and college preparatory courses and activities. We believe this money should be directed back to the classroom.	1,648,937
712	H63	State Department of Education	SAT Improvement	We believe that, because this funding amount is relatively small, the State Department of Education can fund this program from its budget—independent of additional funding. Otherwise, we recommend eliminating this funding because it is too little money to be effective in all 85 school districts. Districts already fund SAT improvement efforts, so cutting this funding does not eliminate all SAT improvement efforts.	280,714

719	H63	State Department of Education	Character Education Program	Last year, we supported the State Department of Education's recommendation to eliminate this funding, and we believe the circumstances surrounding this program have not changed over the past year. Although we believe that character education programs are important, the current funding level is not enough to be effective in all 85 school districts. Additionally, the Education and Economic Development Act mandates character education activities, which makes this activity redundant.	176,988
783	H63	State Department of Education	Felton Lab	The Felton Lab is located on the campus of S.C. State University, and serves 194 students in K-8. The school receives substantial funding in addition to the students' tuition payment of \$1,000 each. We support Felton Lab's mission, offering professional development to aspiring educators, but we believe the program's tuition revenue and special appropriations provide sufficient support. Additionally, other agency school districts at the Department of Juvenile Justice and the School for the Deaf and Blind do not receive similar special line items. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	108,736
795	H63	State Department of Education	Ombudsmen Services	This line item funds a single employee at the Department of Education who fields complaints and concerns about the public education system. We recognize the importance of responding to constituent complaints; however, we believe this service could be effectively provided through the Department of Education's Office of Communications. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	41,110
810	H64	Governor's School for Arts & Humanities	Library	This funding supports 3 library staff for the residential and summer programs. The school receives \$5,865,000 in general funds—and charges student fees—for awareness, recruitment and operations of its summer program. We believe this funding could be better spent toward the library program and that any shortfall should be made up by student fees.	280,181
815	H65	Governor's School for Math & Science	Statewide Outreach	This program is at the Governor's School for Math & Science and provides professional development for K-12 teachers in science and math, which is duplicative of Department of Education efforts. These funds also support a summer science program for middle school students, which falls outside the core mission of the school, which is a residential school for 11th and 12th graders. The program also receives grant funds, so we suggest the school seek more grants or other funding to continue this outreach program.	415,695
826	H67	Educational Television Commission	Educational Radio	ETV funds eight radio stations around the state: five news stations and three classical music/news stations. Not-for-profit educational radio fills an important gap left by the for-profit radio industry. However, when competing for scarce dollars, K-12 and public safety activities are higher priorities than educational radio. In fact, most of ETV's funding comes from private sources: ETV currently holds membership drives three times a year. ETV could increase the number of membership drives or sell more advertising to offset this funding loss.	27,537
1593	L12	John de la Howe	Therapeutic Wilderness Camping	This activity teaches life skills through a one-year, full-time outdoor living experience. This year, there are only 13 boys enrolled in the program. While the intent of this program is worthy, in a tight budget year, we recommend that the agency seek alternative funding.	306,188
1508	P20	Clemson PSA	4-H and Agricultural & Natural Resource Programs for Youth	Our state is facing a deep shortfall this budget cycle. 4-H is a worthwhile activity but, given the budgetary outlook, it should be funded through vocational or Education and Economic Development Act funding.	2,518,974
1271	P28	Dept of Parks, Recreation & Tourism	Interpretive & Resource Management	This activity provides technical assistance to the state's parks concerning park attendance, and provides educational programs to park visitors. Because this activity is not essential to raising student achievement, we believe schools wishing to take advantage of this activity's services should do so using existing programmatic funding devoted to curriculum mastery.	220,177
	H67	Educational Television Commission	Overall Agency	We appreciate the valuable entertainment and educational services that ETV provides, particularly as part of our state's K-12 distance and virtual learning programs. However, many of ETV's programming activities are lower priorities than other areas of state government, and unfortunately this year's budget reduces funding for a number of worthwhile programs. We are reducing ETV's funding this year in favor of increasing funding for core government services, but federal and private funds are available and sufficient to enable ETV's K-12 educational programming to continue.	4,515,233

				Below the Line Savings Subtotal	16,064,376
				Total Goal Area Savings	43,412,505

## Improve our Higher Education System and Cultural Resources

Activity Number		Agency Name	Activity Name	Rationale	Savings Amount
<b>SAVINGS PROPOSALS</b>					
	H09	Citadel	Administration - 15% Reduction	We recommend reducing administrative costs by consolidating administrative functions with nearby institutions. In the past, we have suggested cutting advertising and marketing, but chose not to do so this year. We recognize that advertising and marketing is important for colleges and universities, we firmly believe that these activities should not be funded by higher education institutions during the tough economic times we now face. S.C. has one of the highest in-state tuition rates in the region -- and is among the highest in the nation. At a time when many colleges are furloughing employees and laying off instructors, these funds could be better used to keep professors in the classroom.	1,445,271
	H12	Clemson	Collaboration and Cooperation	We recommend reducing administrative costs at our three research institutions by one percent and encourage these three universities to collaborate on ways to share programs or offer services with reduced funding. We selected these three research institutions because these universities are able to apply for federal research grants and they are eligible to receive funding for endowed chairs. In lean budget years—when Clemson is furloughing employees—we must reduce administrative overhead and direct funding to the classrooms.	620,135
	H15	College of Charleston	Administration - 15% Reduction	We recommend reducing administrative costs by consolidating administrative functions with nearby institutions. In the past, we have suggested cutting advertising and marketing, but chose not to do so this year. We recognize that advertising and marketing is important for colleges and universities, we firmly believe that these activities should not be funded by higher education institutions during the tough economic times we now face. S.C. has one of the highest in-state tuition rates in the region -- and is among the highest in the nation. At a time when many colleges are furloughing employees and laying off instructors, these funds could be better used to keep professors in the classroom.	5,695,761
	H17	Coastal Carolina	Administration - 15% Reduction	We recommend reducing administrative costs by consolidating administrative functions with nearby institutions. In the past, we have suggested cutting advertising and marketing, but chose not to do so this year. We recognize that advertising and marketing is important for colleges and universities, we firmly believe that these activities should not be funded by higher education institutions during the tough economic times we now face. S.C. has one of the highest in-state tuition rates in the region -- and is among the highest in the nation. At a time when many colleges are furloughing employees and laying off instructors, these funds could be better used to keep professors in the classroom.	1,587,460
	H18	Francis Marion University	Administration - 15% Reduction	We recommend reducing administrative costs by consolidating administrative functions with nearby institutions. In the past, we have suggested cutting advertising and marketing, but chose not to do so this year. We recognize that advertising and marketing is important for colleges and universities, we firmly believe that these activities should not be funded by higher education institutions during the tough economic times we now face. S.C. has one of the highest in-state tuition rates in the region -- and is among the highest in the nation. At a time when many colleges are furloughing employees and laying off instructors, these funds could be better used to keep professors in the classroom.	719,800

	H21	Lander University	Administration - 15% Reduction	We recommend reducing administrative costs by consolidating administrative functions with nearby institutions. In the past, we have suggested cutting advertising and marketing, but chose not to do so this year. We recognize that advertising and marketing is important for colleges and universities, we firmly believe that these activities should not be funded by higher education institutions during the tough economic times we now face. S.C. has one of the highest in-state tuition rates in the region -- and is among the highest in the nation. At a time when many colleges are furloughing employees and laying off instructors, these funds could be better used to keep professors in the classroom.	514,649
	H24	South Carolina State University	Administration - 15% Reduction	We recommend reducing administrative costs by consolidating administrative functions with nearby institutions. In the past, we have suggested cutting advertising and marketing, but chose not to do so this year. We recognize that advertising and marketing is important for colleges and universities, we firmly believe that these activities should not be funded by higher education institutions during the tough economic times we now face. S.C. has one of the highest in-state tuition rates in the region -- and is among the highest in the nation. At a time when many colleges are furloughing employees and laying off instructors, these funds could be better used to keep professors in the classroom.	1,330,332
	H27	University of South Carolina	Program Restructuring- Archeology & Anthropology	We propose consolidating the Institute for Archeology and Anthropology—currently located at USC-Columbia—into the Department of Archives and History (DAH). This function could be easily absorbed and housed at DAH as there is adequate physical space and the Institute is consistent with the overall mission of cultural preservation of DAH. Most of our neighboring states house their Archeology programs at their equivalent of our Department of Archives and History.	496,812
	H27	University of South Carolina	Collaboration and Cooperation	We recommend reducing administrative costs at our three research institutions by one percent and encourage these three universities to collaborate on ways to share programs or offer services with reduced funding. We selected these three research institutions because these universities are able to apply for federal research grants and they are eligible to receive funding for endowed chairs. In lean budget years—when USC is furloughing employees—we must reduce administrative overhead and direct funding to the classrooms.	954,143
	H47	Winthrop University	Administration - 15% Reduction	We recommend reducing administrative costs by consolidating administrative functions with nearby institutions. In the past, we have suggested cutting advertising and marketing, but chose not to do so this year. We recognize that advertising and marketing is important for colleges and universities, we firmly believe that these activities should not be funded by higher education institutions during the tough economic times we now face. S.C. has one of the highest in-state tuition rates in the region -- and is among the highest in the nation. At a time when many colleges are furloughing employees and laying off instructors, these funds could be better used to keep professors in the classroom.	976,144
	H09	The Citadel		In September, 2010, the Budget and Control Board took an action that conditioned approval of new capital expenditures on colleges and universities keeping tuition increases under 7 percent -- the HEPI Index for the South Atlantic region for 2010. In response most colleges and universities that had raised tuition by more than 7 percent this year scaled back their tuition increases so as to comply with the Budget and Control Board's action. The Citadel, however, did not. We are reducing the Citadel's appropriation by the amount they generated in tuition increases during the 2010-11 school year above 7 percent.	906,379
	H51	Medical University of South Carolina	Collaboration and Cooperation	We recommend reducing administrative costs at our three research institutions by one percent and encourage these three universities to collaborate on ways to share programs or offer services with reduced funding. We selected these three research institutions because these universities are able to apply for federal research grants and they are eligible to receive funding for endowed chairs. In lean budget years—when MUSC is furloughing employees—we must reduce administrative overhead and direct funding to the classrooms.	513,199
	H59	Board for Technical & Comprehensive Education	Administration - Establishing Three Regions	By consolidating the administrative functions of the technical colleges at three regional centers, we can save over \$22 million.	22,600,000



830	H67	Educational Television Commission	Making It Grow	We believe that funding "Making It Grow" is a low priority when compared to health care, law enforcement, K-12 education, and other critical state functions. We recommend eliminating state funding and focusing remaining funds on the delivery of educational programming to students.	203,460
865	H79	Consolidating Cultural Agencies - Archives & History	Restructuring - Administration	The State Library, State Museum, and Department of Archives and History have discussed sharing human resource functions, and we would like to see this discussion turn into action. By consolidating administrative functions, we will reduce each agency's state administration funds by 18%. We believe that consolidating administration functions will not compromise the mission of our cultural agencies.	163,134
867	H87	Consolidating Cultural Agencies - State Library	Restructuring - Administration	The State Library, State Museum, and Department of Archives and History have discussed sharing human resource functions, and we would like to see this discussion turn into action. By consolidating administrative functions, we will reduce each agency's state administration funds by 18%. We believe that consolidating administration functions will not compromise the mission of our cultural agencies.	90,472
Multiple Activities		Statewide	O&M Higher Education Physical Plant	We recommend reducing operations and maintenance by three percent for higher education institutions within a 25 mile radius of one other. These savings are based on the centralization of facilities management that will afford a reduction in overhead.	8,512,641
Multiple Activities		Statewide - Four-Year and Technical Higher Education Institutions	Administration Standards	As we have advocated in the past, we recommend that our state's higher education institutions share administrative responsibilities. Because most higher education institutions in South Carolina are located within 25 miles of one another, we think it makes no sense for each institution to have separate administrations. Our plan proposes to consolidate administrative responsibilities over two years.	2,935,385
				<b>Cost Savings Subtotal</b>	<b>50,265,177</b>
<b>Making Tough Choices - Below the Line Savings</b>					
283	H03	Commission on Higher Education	Pass Through Savings - University Center of Greenville	The University Center of Greenville is a consortium of public and private colleges and universities offering degree programs to the citizens of the Upstate and surrounding areas. We believe the seven institutions (one of which is private) that comprise the Center can coordinate adequately to support this program from their existing funds without additional state revenue.	1,122,021
284	H03	Commission on Higher Education	Pass Through Savings - Lowcountry Graduate Center	The Lowcountry Graduate Center is a consortium of four public colleges in the Charleston area that offer graduate degree programs, and we strongly support the graduate center's efforts; however, we believe that funding should come from the participating institutions now that the Center has been operating for eight years. Additionally, we recommend reducing these pass-through funds because the agency has no control over how the funds are spent and because pass-through funding diminishes governmental accountability.	811,963
290	H03	Commission on Higher Education	Arts Program Tuition Assistance	We recommend eliminating unnecessary funding for students attending the North Carolina School of the Arts because we have established the S.C. Governor's School for the Arts in Greenville.	7,422
295	H03	Commission on Higher Education	Cutting Edge	In the past, "Cutting Edge" funded several academic programs. Due to funding cuts, all programs other than research have been eliminated. The remaining funds support research by CHE on institutional effectiveness, planning, and assessment research, which is already conducted by higher education institutions in the process of renewing accreditation. Since the only remaining activity in this funding is duplicative of other activities, we recommend eliminating this funding. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	104,083

299	H03	Commission on Higher Education	Higher Education Assistance	The Higher Education Awareness Program (HEAP) provides grants to middle schools for college awareness materials. We recommend eliminating this program because HEAP duplicates career and postsecondary awareness efforts of the Education and Economic Development Act. Additionally, students can research college opportunities for free on CHE's web site ( <a href="http://www.che.sc.gov">www.che.sc.gov</a> ) and through the U.S. Department of Education ( <a href="http://www.college.gov">www.college.gov</a> ). This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	183,003
301	H03	Commission on Higher Education	African-American Loan Program	This CHE program recruits African-American teachers to S.C. State University and Benedict College. We recognize this program's importance, but the current budgetary issues require us to limit this program to its current commitments. We recommend that enrollment in this program be capped at the 20 students currently enrolled in the program and be funded from lottery money currently directed to historically black colleges. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	123,382
1547	H03	Commission on Higher Education	National Foundation of Teaching Entrepreneurship (NFTE)	In a tight budget year, resources should be focused on the CHE's core mission. Private sector support should be sought for this activity.	122,345
1798	H03	Commission on Higher Education	Charleston Transition College Connection	This funding supports a nonprofit corporation committed to helping students with significant mental disabilities transition from school to the workforce. Higher education currently receives close to 20 percent of the total state budget, ranking second in the Southeast in such spending. Nationwide, only six states dedicate a greater percentage of their state budget to higher education than S.C. This type of proviso may, once again, ultimately lead to increasing the tuition burden on students. If CHE believes that this program has merit, then it should fund the program out of its existing budget.	185,309
329	H09	Citadel	Student Services	Student Services programs contribute to the students' well-being and intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. This line may also include admissions and registration activities. Most of the state's institutions of higher education fund this line item without any state general funds (Clemson, Lander, USC-Columbia, USC-Aiken, USC-Beaufort, USC-Lancaster, USC Sumter, USC-Union, USC-Upstate). All state universities should be able to fund their essential student services without state funds and prioritize the other non-instructional programs funded through this line item.	1,110,000
1692	H12	Clemson University	Call Me Mister	This program seeks to address the shortage of African American male teachers in elementary schools around the state. While we appreciate this program's purpose, we believe the funding for this program should be redirected to more critical areas within our educational system. Additionally, in the past, the Call Me Mister program has found financial support from the federal government and from such organizations as BMW, DuPont, Michelin and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.	1,300,000
374	H15	University of Charleston	Public Service	This program seeks to increase the number of faculty that are involved in economic and cultural development throughout the state. While we appreciate this program's efforts, we believe our state colleges should focus funding on classroom instruction and find alternative ways to fund service learning projects.	31,900
377	H15	University of Charleston	Student Services	Student Services programs contribute to the students' well-being and intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. This line may also include admissions and registration activities. Most of the state's institutions of higher education fund this line item without any state general funds (Clemson, Lander, USC-Columbia, USC-Aiken, USC-Beaufort, USC-Lancaster, USC Sumter, USC-Union, USC-Upstate). All state universities should be able to fund their essential student services without state funds and prioritize the other non-instructional programs funded through this line item.	1,388,572

447	H24	S.C. State University	Public Service	S.C. State University offers free courses to the community on small business development. We realize that public service is one of the top missions of public institutions, but in a tight budget year, we believe our state colleges cannot afford to offer educational classes free-of-charge. Additionally, this program is duplicative of the S.C. Department of Commerce's efforts to assist small businesses through the Small Business Ombudsman Office and the Business One Stop, which offer free online information for prospective business owners. We recommend eliminating the program, as the college may be able to offer this class under the 1890 Research & Extension program, which receives federal funds. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	250,000
449	H24	S.C. State University	Student Services	Student Services programs contribute to the students' well-being and intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. This line may also include admissions and registration activities. Most of the state's institutions of higher education fund this line item without any state general funds (Clemson, Lander, USC-Columbia, USC-Aiken, USC-Beaufort, USC-Lancaster, USC Sumter, USC-Union, USC-Upstate). All state universities should be able to fund their essential student services without state funds and prioritize the other non-instructional programs funded through this line item.	1,100,250
1558	H27	University of South Carolina-Columbia	Instruction: Graduate School, and University 101	Funding for this program supports several graduate faculty positions and the University 101 program, which helps freshman get acclimated to college life. Since many freshman do not take this non-mandatory course, we believe USC should fund this program out of its general budget. No other college receives a special line item to fund a University 101 course, and we do not believe USC should be treated differently.	1,276,064
537	H38	USC-Salkehatchie	Pass Through Savings - Leadership Institute	While this local economic development program has merit, we do not believe it is wise to have multiple agencies performing independent development activities. The S.C. Department of Commerce conducts development activities across our state, and we believe the Department is best suited to handle the state's economic development responsibilities.	100,460
563	H47	Winthrop University	Student Services	Student Services programs contribute to the students' well-being and intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. This line may also include admissions and registration activities. Most of the state's institutions of higher education fund this line item without any state general funds (Clemson, the Citadel, Lander, USC-Columbia, USC-Aiken, USC-Beaufort, USC-Lancaster, USC Sumter, USC-Union, USC-Upstate). All state universities should be able to fund their essential student services without state funds and prioritize the other non-instructional programs funded through this line item.	967,049
587	H51	Medical University of South Carolina	Public Assistance	MUSC provides non-instructional services benefiting individuals and groups within the community. While this program is admirable, in a tight budget year, we can mitigate the impact on classroom instruction by reducing appropriations to non-instructional services. This program receives substantial federal and other funds. We recommend eliminating the General Fund appropriation.	3,628,209
590	H51	Medical University of South Carolina	Student Services	Student Services programs contribute to the students' well-being and intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. This line may also include admissions and registration activities. Most of the state's institutions of higher education fund this line item without any state general funds (Clemson, Lander, USC-Columbia, USC-Aiken, USC-Beaufort, USC-Lancaster, USC Sumter, USC-Union, USC-Upstate). All state universities should be able to fund their essential student services without state funds and prioritize the other non-instructional programs funded through this line item.	1,344,649
1565	H51	Medical University of South Carolina	Pass Through Savings, Part 1A - Rural Dentist Incentive	This line item is a pass-through from HHS to MUSC and Area Health Education Consortium (AHEC). This program, requested by neither HHS, MUSC, nor AHEC, provides funding to incentivize dentists to serve rural populations. We acknowledge the challenge in attracting dentists to practice in the state's rural areas, but this money amounts to a little more than \$5,000 per county. We do not believe such a small amount is enough to attract young students leaving dental school to practice in rural areas, and we recommend eliminating funding for this activity.	176,101
649	H59	Board for Technical & Comprehensive Education	Trident Tech-Culinary Arts	We recommend suspending funding for this program. While the program may merit state funding, it was added by the General Assembly without appropriate program review imposed upon other potential programs. This bypass is an example of failure by our higher education governance structure.	481,817

668	H59	Board for Technical & Comprehensive Education	Community Service Programs	This program offers non-credit courses to community members at all 16 technical colleges. Participants pay for the courses, which are day-long community-focused seminars. General funds are used to pay a portion of the instructors' salaries. Because the program can be sustained by the \$3 million it generates annually, we recommended eliminating state funding for this program. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	547,704
1710	H59	Board for Technical & Comprehensive Education	Florence-Darlington-SIMT	This program, created in the last 4 years, was originally intended to equip the new Southeastern Institute of Manufacturing and Technology (SIMT) with state-of-the-art technologies. SIMT charges companies a fee in return for manufacturer training and support. This year, the program will bring in an estimated \$450,000, and will ultimately be self-sustaining. The success of this public-private partnership should cover future equipment costs and make funding unnecessary in FY 2011-12.	932,549
1825	H59	Board for Technical & Comprehensive Education	Apprenticeship	This new activity, added in the last 4 years, supports business-led initiatives for a statewide registered-apprenticeship process. The technical college system last year created a statewide registered-apprenticeship program. Agencies inform us that program funding can be reduced by \$363,294 without impacting their ability to accomplish the program's mission. We recommend reducing funding for personnel, overhead, and travel costs.	584,550
876	H91	Arts Commission	Arts Education	Like many states, our state's difficult financial position this year has forced us to make some equally difficult funding decisions. In this year's Executive Budget, we have proposed eliminating the Arts Commission. We recognize that artistic and cultural programs add great value to our state, but we simply cannot justify spending money on arts programs when other core academic programs are facing steep budget cuts. We recommend transferring the Arts Commission's responsibility for grant administration to the State Department of Education.	506,459
877	H91	Arts Commission	Community Arts Development	Like many states, our state's difficult financial position this year has forced us to make some equally difficult funding decisions. In this year's Executive Budget, we have proposed eliminating the Arts Commission. We recognize that artistic and cultural programs add great value to our state, but we simply cannot justify spending money on arts programs when law enforcement and core academic programs are facing steep budget cuts. We recommend transferring the Arts Commission's responsibility for grant administration to the State Department of Education.	929,945
878	H91	Arts Commission	Artist Development	Like many states, our state's difficult financial position this year has forced us to make some equally difficult funding decisions. In this year's Executive Budget, we have proposed eliminating the Arts Commission. We recognize that artistic and cultural programs add great value to our state, but we simply cannot justify spending money on arts programs when law enforcement and core academic programs are facing steep budget cuts. We recommend transferring the Arts Commission's responsibility for grant administration to the State Department of Education.	123,214
880	H91	Arts Commission	Administration	Like many states, our state's difficult financial position this year has forced us to make some equally difficult funding decisions. In this year's Executive Budget, we have proposed eliminating the Arts Commission. We recognize that artistic and cultural programs add great value to our state, but we simply cannot justify spending money on arts programs when law enforcement and core academic programs are facing steep budget cuts. We recommend transferring the Arts Commission's responsibility for grant administration to the State Department of Education.	491,228
881	H95	State Museum	Collections	Given that our state has cut over \$2 billion from the budget since the economic downturn, we are forced to eliminate all but the most necessary programs from the state's activities. Although we recognize the State Museum's value and popularity, this year we recommend eliminating state funding for the Museum. Cultural activities are obviously important, but the vast majority of this year's budget is directed to core governmental functions like public safety, education, and health care. We certainly do not advocate closing the Museum, and we believe the Museum can make up the cut in state funding through grants, private donations, or increased admittance fees.	450,463

882	H95	State Museum	Education	Given that our state has cut over \$2 billion from the budget since the economic downturn, we are forced to eliminate all but the most necessary programs from the state's activities. Although we recognize the State Museum's value and popularity, this year we recommend eliminating state funding for the Museum. Cultural activities are obviously important, but the vast majority of this year's budget is directed to core governmental functions like public safety, education, and health care. We certainly do not advocate closing the Museum, and we believe the Museum can make up the cut in state funding through grants, private donations, or increased admittance fees.	637,200
883	H95	State Museum	Exhibits	Given that our state has cut over \$1.5 billion from the budget since the economic downturn, we are forced to eliminate all but the most necessary programs from the state's activities. Although we recognize the State Museum's value and popularity, this year we recommend eliminating state funding for the Museum. Cultural activities are obviously important, but the vast majority of this year's budget is directed to core governmental functions like public safety, education, and health care. We certainly do not advocate closing the Museum, and we believe the Museum can make up the cut in state funding through grants, private donations, or increased admittance fees.	692,761
884	H95	State Museum	Operations	Given that our state has cut over \$1.5 billion from the budget since the economic downturn, we are forced to eliminate all but the most necessary programs from the state's activities. Although we recognize the State Museum's value and popularity, this year we recommend eliminating state funding for the Museum. Cultural activities are obviously important, but the vast majority of this year's budget is directed to core governmental functions like public safety, education, and health care. We certainly do not advocate closing the Museum, and we believe the Museum can make up the cut in state funding through grants, private donations, or increased admittance fees.	231,088
885	H95	State Museum	Facilities	Given that our state has cut over \$1.5 billion from the budget since the economic downturn, we are forced to eliminate all but the most necessary programs from the state's activities. Although we recognize the State Museum's value and popularity, this year we recommend eliminating state funding for the Museum. Cultural activities are obviously important, but the vast majority of this year's budget is directed to core governmental functions like public safety, education, and health care. We certainly do not advocate closing the Museum, and we believe the Museum can make up the cut in state funding through grants, private donations, or increased admittance fees.	185,391
886	H95	State Museum	Administration	Given that our state has cut over \$2 billion from the budget since the economic downturn, we are forced to eliminate all but the most necessary programs from the state's activities. Although we recognize the State Museum's value and popularity, this year we recommend eliminating state funding for the Museum. Cultural activities are obviously important, but the vast majority of this year's budget is directed to core governmental functions like public safety, education, and health care. We certainly do not advocate closing the Museum, and we believe the Museum can make up the cut in state funding through grants, private donations, or increased admittance fees.	598,460
				Below the Line Savings Subtotal	22,725,611
				Total Goal Area Savings	72,990,788

## Improve the Conditions for Economic Growth

Activity Number		Agency Name	Activity Name	Rationale	Savings Amount
<b>SAVINGS PROPOSALS</b>					
1215	P16	Department of Agriculture	Consumer Services - Petroleum Inspection & Testing Program	The Department of Agriculture currently inspects all fuel dispensers, and weighing and measuring devices in the state. The Governor's MAP Commission suggested the Department of Agriculture could check a representative sample of dispensers and weighing and measuring devices while ensuring consumer protection. Additionally, the MAP Commission suggested giving the Department of Agriculture the authority to levy fines in cases of abuse. We support these recommendations. MAP estimated that adopting these suggestions would save \$223,047 annually. In a tight budget cycle, these reforms make sense.	223,047
1306	U30	Aeronautics Commission	Airport Development	These provisos, which we vetoed in 2009, transfer Aeronautics to the Budget and Control Board to prevent the Department of Commerce's (Commerce) attempt to save money by cutting pilots, relocating operations, and contracting with private companies for maintenance work. We recommend eliminating this proviso and allowing Aeronautics to implement whatever changes it sees fit and thereby realize the available cost savings.	360,000
				<b>Cost Savings Subtotal</b>	583,047
<b>Making Tough Choices - Below the Line Savings</b>					
648	H59	Board for Technical & Comprehensive Education	Florence - Darlington Entrepreneurial Operations Equipment	The Technical & Comprehensive Education Board originally requested these funds to buy new equipment for the Southeastern Institute of Manufacturing Technology (SIMT). The SIMT is now up and running. We support SIMT's mission because it will spur economic development in the Pee Dee, but we believe the SIMT's success as a public-private partnership will cover future equipment costs. Because the SIMT expects to generate \$450,000 in FY 2008-09 to balance its budget, and expects to generate a profit in FY 2009-10, we recommend eliminating state funding from this self-sustaining program. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	310,850
1216	P16	Department of Agriculture	Marketing and Promotions	Through the S.C. Grown marketing campaign, the agency seeks to bring attention to agricultural products grown, processed, or manufactured in this state. We recommend eliminating this program because Clemson PSA conducts a similar program for about 1/3 of the cost.	722,932
1484	P20	Clemson PSA	Rural Community Leadership Development	We recommend suspending this activity because it is outside Clemson PSA's core mission, and because the program's goal is duplicative of services provided through the South Carolina Department of Commerce. Additionally, the results team did not rank this program as a priority.	61,295
1495	P20	Clemson PSA	Agricultural Biotechnology	Through this program, Clemson PSA collaborates with SC Bioengineering Alliance and the Department of Commerce to attract biotech companies to the state and assist in new company start ups. While we have advocated funding this activity in the past, the Department of Commerce is currently equipped to carry out these functions without additional funding in this tight budget year. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	1,913,103
1496	P20	Clemson PSA	Risk Management Systems for Agricultural Firms	This program, through which Clemson PSA provides economic analysis of agricultural firms, conducts market assessments, and educates farm owners on productive marketing strategies, duplicates existing efforts. The Department of Agriculture's programs to assist farmers in exporting products to local, national, and international markets, as well as the various Commodity Board's activities to promote specific products.	520,404

1502	P20	Clemson PSA	Rural Community Economic Development	With this program, Clemson PSA seeks to enhance economic development in rural areas through workforce analysis, business development strategies, policy formation, surveys to enhance workforce preparedness, and business retention efforts. Economic development falls outside of what we consider to be Clemson PSA's core mission: agrisystems productivity and profitability. This rural development program duplicates services already provided by the Department of Commerce's Community and Rural Development program and Grants and Incentives program. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	97,565
1224	P21	S C State PSA	Community Leadership and Economic Development	S.C. State University's public service activity program provides leadership development and economic development programs in financially disadvantaged communities. While we recognize the laudable goals of this program, economic development does not fit within the core mission of S.C. State PSA: agrisystems productivity and profitability. As we recommended in past budgets, all rural and community economic development programs should be consolidated under the Department of Commerce, which already successfully conducts these activities. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	272,607
1281	P28	Parks, Recreation and Tourism	Regional Promotions	This program passes revenue through PRT to fund regional tourism promotions. Because PRT does not have flexibility in allocating these funds, and regional tourism districts have alternative revenue streams in the form of local grants and funding, we support the agency's recommendation to eliminate this program. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	1,375,000
1432	R60	Department of Workforce and Investment	SC Occupational Information	The S.C. Occupational Information System is a worthwhile system, but already receives \$385,600 from the EEDA. Additionally, other career information systems are available, such as Kuder. The Kuder career information system is available for use in One-Stop Employment Offices. Kuder 4 Adults will be ready to use by June 2009. More school districts prefer the Kuder system to SCOIS. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	429,716
				Below the Line Savings Subtotal	5,703,472
				Total Goal Area Savings	6,286,519

## Improve the Health and Protection of Our Children and Adults

Activity Number		Agency Name	Activity Name	Rationale	Savings Amount
<b>SAVINGS PROPOSALS</b>					
78	D17	Continuum of Care (Governor's Office OEPP)	Administration - Restructuring	We can capture these administrative savings from restructuring. For further information, see the text.	70,548
838	H73	Vocational Rehabilitation	Administrative Savings - Restructuring	By merging the Vocational Rehabilitation Department and the Commission for the Blind, we can realize efficiencies and lower costs without adversely affecting the quality of service provided by both agencies, as recommended by a 2002 LAC report. Both agencies agree that they have similar primary missions and that a merger of administrative functions is appropriate. For further explanation, please see text.	590,663
949	J04	Department of Health and Environmental Control - Health	Administration - Restructuring	We can capture these administrative savings from restructuring our health agencies. For further information, see the text.	4,197,236
949	J04	Department of Health and Environmental Control	Administration	We can capture these administrative savings from restructuring our environmental agencies. For further information, see the text.	1,000,000
	J04	Department of Health and Environmental Control	Collections	The Legislative Audit Council recommends increasing the rate of collections by 10%. This increase can be achieved by verifying income for reduced fee patients, implementing a uniform billing and collection policy for health districts, and participating in the Department of Revenue's programs for debt collection in health service programs.	180,000
1010	J12	Department of Mental Health	Administration - Restructuring	We can capture these administrative savings from restructuring. For further information, see the text.	5,262,488
	J12	Department of Mental Health	Collections	Increase Rate of Collections by 10% per LAC Report recommendations. This can be done by verifying income for reduced fee patients, using Setoff Debt and GEAR programs, and having community mental health centers utilize the lien process against estates like DMH headquarters does.	840,000
1033	J16	Department of Disabilities and Special Needs	Administration - Restructuring	We can capture these administrative savings from restructuring. For further information, see the text.	1,938,303
1040	J20	Department of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Services	Administration - Restructuring	We can capture these administrative savings from restructuring. For further information, see the text.	208,737
1109	L04	Department of Social Services	Contract / Pass Through Funds	The agency recommends cutting this pass-through, and we agree. In 2008, we vetoed this proviso because it created the illusion of a competitive process, which in reality would likely steer money to two nonprofits, Heritage Community Services and Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy. As we have stated in the past, we do not believe government should pick winners and losers among non-profit organizations. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	1,093,944
1126	L24	Commission for the Blind	Vocational Rehabilitation Services	We recommend transferring training programs to the newly established S.C. Center of the Blind. This same training program can be done for a reduced cost outside of the public sector.	150,000
1133	L24	Commission for the Blind	Administrative Savings - Restructuring	By merging the Vocational Rehabilitation Department and the Commission for the Blind, we can realize efficiencies and lower costs without adversely affecting the quality of service provided by both agencies as recommended by a 2002 LAC report. Both agencies agree that they have similar primary missions and that a merger of administrative functions is appropriate. For further explanation, please see text.	194,183
1154	L46	Commission on Minority Affairs	Administration (Overhead Cost)	The Department of Social Services, the Employment Security Commission, and the Department of Education each provides services to the Commission on Minority Affairs' clients, in addition to efforts by several non-profit organizations. We recommend that the Commission on Minority Affairs consolidate some of its administrative responsibilities within the Governor's Office of Executive Policy and Programs, thereby saving over \$100,000.	102,058



				Cost Savings Subtotal	15,828,160
<b>Making Tough Choices - Below the Line Savings</b>					
109	E04	Lieutenant Governor's Office	Local Provider Salary Supplement	This funding provides salary supplements to non-state employees working for the local aging service providers. We recommend diverting salary supplements to non-state aging employees to the Long Term Ombudsman.	78,000
1535	E04	Lieutenant Governor	State Level Activity Geriatric Physician Program	This program funds loan forgiveness for doctors who agree to practice geriatrics in South Carolina for at least 5 years. While we believe this is a worthy goal, and recognize S.C. is the only state to give this type of incentive, we recommend that the program seek alternate funding. For example, the American Geriatric Society supports the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, which recruits health professionals to provide primary health services in areas that lack adequate medical care. In return, the federal government offers to forgive the doctors' student loans. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	35,000
1657	E04	Lieutenant Governor	Silver Haired Legislature	In past years, this activity was funded by private donations. In addition, this group often lobbies the Legislature for programs that they believe benefit our state's senior population. We issued an executive order during our first year prohibiting cabinet agencies from hiring lobbyists and recommended eliminating all state-funded lobbyists because we do not believe that taxpayer funds should be used to advocate for more public funds.	13,500
1560	H27	University of South Carolina - Columbia Campus	Palmetto Poison Control Initiative	The Palmetto Poison Center (PPC) serves as the regional poison control center and is the only poison control resource in the State. The PPC is a cooperative effort of Palmetto Richland Memorial Hospital and the USC College of Pharmacy, which provides free services to the public and health professionals. Although this is a worthwhile program, it should be run by one of the state's health agencies, not a state university.	176,763
588	H51	Medical University of South Carolina	Diabetes Center	The Diabetes Center at MUSC develops and implements a statewide plan of community outreach and education programs related to diabetes. While we recognize the importance of preventing and treating diabetes, we are vetoing the funding for this activity because it is a special item outside of MUSC's primary mission of instructing students to become health professionals. Additionally, DHEC currently manages the South Carolina Diabetes Prevention and Control Program, which receives significant federal funding through the Centers of Disease Control. To the extent that MUSC wants to continue its role in providing diabetes education and outreach, we encourage them to partner with DHEC through its existing and better funded diabetes program.	289,088
1814	H51	Medical University of South Carolina	Hypertension Initiative	DHEC's Bureau of Community Health and Chronic Disease Prevention is part of a network of chronic disease prevention programs aimed at improving the health of our communities across South Carolina. Additionally, SC was one of 20 states which received funding for a new five-year cycle for a Capacity Building Heart Disease and Stroke Program. This activity duplicates these efforts and should therefore be eliminated.	240,433
596	H53	Area Health Education Consortium	Health Careers Program	This program, formerly known as the Student Development and Diversity Program, is a well-intended statewide program to get more students interested in health professions. For three years, the Duke Endowment has funded more than half of the initiative. However, AHEC has difficulty collecting the pertinent data to determine whether or not the program is successful. Additionally, this program is less critical than other, core health services competing for scarce taxpayer dollars and should therefore be eliminated.	221,771
602	H53	Area Health Education Consortium	Recruitment - Nursing Recruitment Center	The agency recommends cutting this activity, and we agree. The Nursing Recruitment Center was originally initiated to address the shortage of nursing professionals. However, some of this money has been used to sponsor a conference. These funds are not large enough to make a difference in recruiting, and we cannot afford to spend our limited dollars on conferences. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	26,393

924	J02	Health & Human Services	Family Planning Services Administration	Medicaid Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Services (MAPPS) is available to all at-risk Medicaid youths, through community or school-based programs that have contracts with HHS. Currently, there are 25 MAPPS providers throughout South Carolina, with an average allocation of a little more than \$16,000 per provider. However, HHS recommends eliminating this pass through—the agency has little control over how this money is spent. We agree with the agency's assessment and further reiterate that government should not choose winners and losers among non-profits. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	42,081
969	J04	Health and Environmental Control	Palmetto Aids Life Support	This line item is a pass-through appropriation to Palmetto AIDS Life Support. DHEC recommends cutting the funding for this program, and we agree. Unfortunately, the state provides no direction on how these funds are to be used—and there is no accountability after they are spent. Furthermore, South Carolina currently receives more than \$47 million dollars annually from the federal programs (Ryan White Program, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office of Minority Health) and \$5 million from other state sources to combat AIDS. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	26,882
1153	L46	Minority Affairs	Research	The purpose of this division at the Minority Affairs Commission is to conduct research of minority populations. However, this activity duplicates services currently provided by the SC Office of Research and Statistics. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	77,953
1222	P21	S C State PSA	Nutrition, Education, Diet and Health	S.C. State University's public service activity program provides low-income families with nutrition education that promotes healthy living and allows the opportunity to assess and deter obesity. Our administration has been very vocal in support for health and exercise programs and recognizes the important service provided by this program. However, we recommend eliminating this program because it duplicates DHEC's obesity awareness campaign (SCCOPE), which fosters statewide efforts to promote healthy lifestyles. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	272,607
				Below the Line Savings Subtotal	1,500,471
				Total Goal Area Savings	17,328,631

## Improve the Quality of Our Natural Resources

Activity Number		Agency Name	Activity Name	Rationale	Savings Amount
<b>SAVINGS PROPOSALS</b>					
1206	P12	Forestry Commission	Administration Agency Consolidation	Among our restructuring recommendations, we propose consolidating DHEC functions, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the Forestry Commission into the newly formed Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Doing so will produce administrative savings of \$395,297. For further information, please see text.	395,297
1478	P20	Clemson PSA	Administration	Clemson PSA should be able to reduce administrative staff as a result of fewer responsibilities. Proviso 35.4 authorizes Clemson PSA to spend up to \$75,000 on the Dairy Day Exhibition. Although we appreciate this exhibition's contribution to the agricultural industry, we recommend eliminating this proviso. Given the current budgetary circumstances, we believe Clemson should redirect the Dairy Day funds back to more critical needs and services.	75,000
1503	P20	Clemson PSA	Livestock-Poultry Health Programs: Meat Inspection	This activity should be transferred to DHEC, thereby saving an estimated half of its current general fund needs.	474,836
1236	P24	Department of Natural Resources	Administration Agency Consolidation	Among our restructuring recommendations, we propose consolidating DHEC functions, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the Forestry Commission into the newly formed Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Doing so will produce administrative savings of \$762,726. For further information, please see text.	762,726
1237	P24	Department of Natural Resources	Provide Public Information	DNR funds provide public information as required by the Administrative Procedures Act, and funds news releases, publications, public speaking, and the creation of the ETV S.C. Wildlife Show. We recommend continuing funding for information required by the APA. However, in a tough budget year, we recommend eliminating funds not tied to APA mandated information--roughly 25% of this activity's funding. Additionally, this activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	70,000
				<b>Cost Savings Subtotal</b>	1,777,859
<b>Making Tough Choices - Below the Line Savings</b>					
993	J04	DHEC	Emergency Medical Services	This program allocates funds, through DHEC, to county and regional emergency service providers to improve and upgrade emergency medical systems. We support DHEC's recommendation to eliminate this pass-through, and we recommend service providers postpone any non-essential system improvements for one year. In lieu of general funds, counties and EMS providers may request county funds as needed. Additionally, local jurisdictions receive nearly \$49 million annually through Homeland Security Grant Programs, which could be used to replace this funding. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	890,526
1194	P12	Forestry Commission	Enforcement - Timber Theft and Fraud	We recommend consolidating forestry-specific law enforcement, dedicated to timber fraud and theft, with DNR law enforcement. DNR officers are capable of performing this function, along with their current responsibilities, without any additional general funds.	201,356

1196	P12	Forestry Commission	Forest Management Assistance	This program provides direct assistance to public and private landowners for woodland development and management. Given the state's current fiscal situation, and because private forestry consultants provide similar services, we believe the individuals or entities that benefit from this service should fund this service without the aid of state funds. Any non-core government activity that can be handled by the private sector generally should be handled by the private sector. Critical needs in other budget areas take precedence over the state's contribution to this program. Finally, this activity was ranked a low priority by previous budget results teams.	1,196,254
1198	P12	Forestry Commission	Forest Renewal Program Financial Assistance	We recommend discontinuing the Forest Management Assistance subsidy, which pays for a portion of replanting the first 100 acres of private lands. Planning services from the Forestry Commission will continue to provide significant assistance in expertise for private landowners.	200,000
1205	P12	Forestry Commission	Outreach	This program informs citizens about the state's forest resources services. Forestry commission personnel design and conduct forestry educational classes for teachers and school groups. While teaching our students about the state's natural resources is important, in tough budget times, we believe that critical needs in other budget areas take precedence over the state's contribution to this activity. Additionally, the Environmental Protection Agency awards \$2-\$3 million dollars annually in Environmental Education grants. We recommend the agency apply for this federal funding. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	50,497
1480	P20	Clemson PSA	Television, Web, and Print Productions	We have previously recommended reducing funding for this program, and we recommend eliminating funding for this program altogether.	800,545
1482	P20	Clemson PSA	Horticultural Crops	We have already reduced funding for the portion of this activity that goes towards turf-grass research. We recommend eliminating funding for this program altogether. This activity conducts research and educational activities concerning vineyards, vegetables, herbs, and fruit. Additionally, some of the funding goes to research disease and pest management practices, pesticide use, and crop production. In light of the challenges our state is facing, crop research is not a sufficiently high priority this year.	3,076,637
1487	P20	Clemson PSA	Natural Resources and Environmental Research and Education	This Clemson PSA program focuses on research and education programs that address the impact of land use on our state's water resources. Currently, CPSC and DHEC coordinate research and together regulate water-use. Because DHEC receives substantial funding to oversee water quality and use, we believe DHEC is presently equipped to manage our water resources without assistance from CPSC. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	1,139,312
1488	P20	Clemson PSA	Natural Resources and Environmental Research and Education	Clemson PSA performs research and educational services relating to agriculture, forestry, wildlife habitat conditions in the Southeast, and the effects of climate change on coastal communities. Although we recognize this research is valuable, we recommend reducing state funding for this program. In such a tight budget year, we believe state funding should focus on core functions of government like public safety. Cutting this line item will not eliminate Clemson PSA's research funding, which exceeds \$9 million not counting this line item.	775,063
1489	P20	Clemson PSA	Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems; Nutraceutical Crops	This program provides research and education programs about the health benefits of nutraceutical crops, which are crops primarily incorporated into pharmaceutical products like vitamin supplements. We believe this program should be eliminated because it duplicates similar research and education programs currently available from the United States Department of Agriculture. Currently, the USDA Agricultural Research Service Division conducts readily-available research on nutraceutical crops. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	79,578
1490	P20	Clemson PSA	Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems; Organic Crops	Clemson PSA conducts research and educational programs about the benefits and methods of organic farming. We recommend eliminating this funding because this program duplicates the USDA's National Organic Program and the EPA's Organic Farming Program. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	129,427

1491	P20	Clemson PSA	Reducing the Impact of Animal Agriculture on the Environment	We have previously recommended reducing funding for this program. This year, we recommend eliminating funding altogether. This line provides statewide research and educational programs for animal agriculture producers in an effort to reduce the environmental impact of animal waste. We believe the industries and individuals that benefit from this program should support the program through fees.	211,591
1497	P20	Clemson PSA	Integrated Pest Management (IPM) for Agriculture and Forestry	Clemson PSA conducts research and educational programs for farmers and landscapers to adopt alternative pest management systems. We recommend eliminating state funding for this program because alternative fundings sources, like federal or private grants, could go to support this program. For example, in the past, USDA's Pest Management Alternatives Grant Program awarded Clemson \$113,432 in 2008. Additionally, the individuals or businesses that benefit from this research could be required to pay a fee for the service. The program also receives \$309,168 in federal funding, which has no state matching requirement.	836,355
1498	P20	Clemson PSA	Sustainable Forestry	Clemson PSA provides "best management" forestry programs, but the Forestry Commission already provides similar sustainable forestry programs. We recommend integrating all forestry programs under the Forestry Commission.	1,272,167
1507	P20	Clemson PSA	Regulatory and Public Service Programs: Pesticide Regulation	Clemson PSA regulates pesticides, pesticide licensure, and agroterrorism. We propose moving the licensure responsibilities to LLR, not only to allow the program to be self-sufficient, but the agency is better suited to oversee licensing of professions. Additionally, the pesticide regulation responsibilities would be transferred to DHEC, the endangered species protection program to DNR, and the agroterrorism responsibilities to SLED. The related federal funding would be allocated pro rata to the appropriate agencies.	125,531
1514	P20	Clemson PSA	Sustainable Agricultural Productions Systems	This Clemson PSA program conducts research and educational programs for farmers. The research focuses on new technology and management systems to improve crop yield and resistance to disease and pests. This program duplicates readily-available research on agronomic crops that is conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Plant and Physiology and Genetics Research Division. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	2,824,341
1515	P20	Clemson PSA	Pesticide Applicator Licenses	The pesticide licensure program should be self-sufficient, as are most licensed professions under LLR. By providing license applications and license renewal online through LLR and extending renewal cycles to the maximum feasible period, this program can achieve self-sufficiency within two years. This amount represents half of the general funds appropriated for this activity.	301,232
1221	P21	SC State PSA	Sustainable Agriculture	This SC State University PSA program assists minority owners of small farms develop effective farming and management practices. While this program provides a worthy service, we believe that the USDA's Small Farms programs and grants provide owners of small farms with sufficient training and support. Additionally, the USDA Center for Minority Farmers opened in September 2004. The Center has become a one-stop help program for minority farmers, limited resource farmers, community based organizations and others. In a tough budget year, we recommend eliminating this funding. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	545,214
1238	P24	Department of Natural Resources	Outreach and Education Services	This program funds staff at DNR to teach about animal and wildlife conservation in state schools. In lean budget years, we should focus state funding toward core education subject areas, such as reading and math. Additionally, many privately- and federally-funded programs provide teachers and students with similar educational materials. We recommend eliminating state funding, in part because the state's matching funds necessary to receive a federal grant of \$71,197 do not come from general fund revenue, and thus the grant will not be affected by a budgetary cut. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	250,950
1272	P28	Parks, Recreation and Tourism	Recreation & Grants - PRT combined the Recreation & Planning aspect of Recreation, Planning & Engineering with Community & Economic Development to form Tourism & Recreation Development Office	The program works to enhance tourism-related economic development efforts, provides PRT-related support to local communities, and performs planning and research for park development and facilitates federal grants for local projects. Activity receives over \$5 million in funding, of which only \$670,591 is state funding (remainder is federal and "other"). The \$670K goes towards FTE's and other admin. costs associated with administering the various grants and conducting research. The state funds are not part of any federal matching requirements, and PRT can federal funds for admin costs.	315,063

				Below the Line Savings Subtotal	15,221,639
				Total Goal Area Savings	16,999,498

## Improve the Safety of People and Property

Activity Number		Agency Name	Activity Name	Rationale	Savings Amount
<b>SAVINGS PROPOSALS</b>					
1058	K05	Department of Public Safety	Highway and Traffic Enforcement	We recommend eliminating Proviso 49.1, which prevents the Department of Public Safety (DPS) from charging a fee for providing traffic control at football games and other special events. DPS spends \$647,702 per year providing these services, but is not allowed to recover these costs.	647,702
1058	K05	Department of Public Safety	Highway and Traffic Enforcement	We recommend changing the oil in state vehicles every 5,000 miles (per the manufacturer's recommendation) instead of every 3,000 miles (as recommended by oil-change shops). The state of Arizona has implemented this recommendation, and realized cost savings. If S.C. were to do so, we would realize cost savings of \$46,630.	46,630
1158	N04	Department of Corrections	Vehicle Maintenance	We recommend shifting a portion of funding for vehicle maintenance provided by the Department of Corrections from recurring general fund sources to other fund sources. As we phased out the general fund subsidy to agencies several years ago for security services provided by the Department of Public Safety, we believe that agencies which benefit from this activity should pay the Department of Corrections for these services.	500,000
1177	N08	Department of Probation, Parole & Pardon Services	Parole Board	We recommend combining the parole boards at the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) and the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (DPPP). The parole board at DPPP has seven members and a general fund budget of \$709,292 (including board support services). The DJJ parole board, with ten members and a general fund budget of \$155,230, hears far fewer cases per year. Merging the parole boards should save around \$425,000 annually in general funds.	144,119
1179	N08	Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services	Administration - Restructuring	Reducing administrative costs through the consolidation of the Department of Corrections and the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services will produce cost savings of \$622,126. For further explanation, please see text.	2,000,000
1178	N08	Department of Probation, Parole & Pardon Services	Parole Board	We recommend combining the parole boards at the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) and the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (DPPP). The parole board at DPPP has seven members and a general fund budget of \$709,292 (including board support services). The DJJ parole board, with ten members and a general fund budget of \$753,208, hears far fewer cases per year. Merging the parole boards should save around \$425,000 annually in general funds.	59,928
1190	N12	Department of Juvenile Justice	Parole Board	We recommend combining the parole boards at the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) and the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (DPPP). The parole board at DPPP has seven members and a general fund budget of \$709,292 (including board support services). The DJJ parole board, with ten members and a general fund budget of \$753,208, hears far fewer cases per year. Merging the parole boards should save around \$425,000 annually in general funds.	220,953
				<b>Cost Savings Subtotal</b>	3,619,332
<b>Making Tough Choices - Below the Line Savings</b>					

182	E24	Adjutant General's Office	Public Information	This program helps to disseminate emergency and disaster-related information to the public. We recommend suspending general funding for this activity because other state agencies and the media provide similar information. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	63,607
194	E24	Adjutant General	Funeral Caisson	The caisson unit performs funerals for military personnel and law enforcement officers killed in line of duty, and provides military history education for civic events. Because the unit's personnel are volunteers, funding provides mainly for upkeep of horses and the unit's transportation. In the past, the Director of the Department of Corrections has offered to house the eight member caisson team at the Wateree Correctional Institute Prison Farm outside of Camden. This facility can absorb a great deal, if not all, of the expenses associated with the care of the horses. As we have mentioned in previous vetoes of this activity, we are hopeful that through this type of creative thinking, state funding for the caisson can be shifted to other pressing priorities without diminishing the benefits of this special program. This activity has been ranked as a low priority by past budget results teams.	100,205
196	E24	Adjutant General's Office	Operations & Training	This program facilitates communication between National Guard personnel, the State Emergency Operations Center, and local officials for operations and training for emergency/disaster operations. We recommend suspending general funds for this activity because this activity is redundant of existing Adjutant General's Office operations and training efforts.	24,311
				Below the Line Savings Subtotal	188,123
				Total Goal Area Savings	3,807,455



## Improve the Efficiencies and Effectiveness of Central State Government Support and Other Governmental Services

Activity Number		Agency Name	Activity Name	Rationale	Savings Amount
<b>SAVINGS PROPOSALS</b>					
1	A01	Senate	Legislative Policy Setting	We have long advocated shortening the legislative session, as many other states have already done. Shortening the session from 66 legislative days to 33 legislative days, as Senator Darrell Jackson, Senator Ryberg, Senator Campsen, Senator Shoopman, and Senator Davis have proposed, will result in a total cost savings of \$668,100.	182,000
1	A01	Senate	Legislative Policy Setting	The Senate received a base received a base budget increase of \$3,835,896 this last fiscal year. It is not right that the Senate received a base increase to their budget when other agencies have experienced up to 50 percent cuts to their base budgets. As a result, we support taking the Senate's budget back to FY 10 levels.	3,835,896
2	A05	House of Representatives	Legislative Policy Setting	We have long advocated shortening the legislative session, as many other states have already done. Shortening the session from 66 legislative days to 33 legislative days, as Senator Darrell Jackson, Senator Ryberg, Senator Campsen, Senator Shoopman, and Senator Davis have proposed, will result in a total cost savings of \$668,100.	486,100
2	A05	House of Representatives	Legislative Policy Setting	The House of Representatives received a base budget increase of \$2,160,394 this last fiscal year. It is not right that the House of Representatives would receive a budget increase when other agencies have received up to 50 percent reductions to their base budgets. As a result, we recommend taking the House's budget back to FY 10 levels.	2,160,394
159	E23	Appellate/Indigent Defense	Merger	By capturing the administrative savings resulting from the consolidation of the Offices of Appellate and Indigent Defense that occurred during the FY 2005-06 legislative session, we can produce cost savings of \$268,701	273,361
949	J04	Department of Health and Environmental Control	Reduce the DB2 system processing cost to DHEC.	The GEAR Report suggests, in Recommendation # 32, that the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) processing costs for the DB2 database can be reduced to the costs proposed to DHEC by IBM. We support this recommendation because we believe DHEC should be allowed to work directly with the vendor and that other state agencies that use the current DB2 database should be allowed to choose whether to continue with their current arrangements or use more efficient arrangements. DHEC is currently paying \$1.7 million per year to the state data center for DB2 processing. IBM has proposed that, for \$1 million in one-time costs, DHEC could get the same services for \$79,000 per year, resulting in cost savings of \$600,000 in FY 2011-2012.	600,000
	R44	Department of Revenue	Lease Savings	The Department of Revenue, the State Museum, and the Confederate Relic Room are together housed at the former Columbia Mill. Currently, these agencies lease space at this state-owned building from the Budget and Control Board for \$12 per square foot. Because we believe that these agencies could operate and maintain their office space for less money, we recommend turning this building over to these agencies. This recommendation will result in total cost savings of \$455,579.	455,579
Multiple Activities		All Agencies with TERI employees	Rehire TERI Employees at Agency Average Compensation	The second class of TERI participants hit the five-year mark this past calendar year. We recommend that the agencies do not hire the majority of these employees back—as many agencies already plan to do—and disburse job duties among remaining employees, while also hiring new individuals who will be trained for the long-run.	2,374,808
Multiple Activities		All Agencies	5% Salary Reduction Statewide	We support a 5% salary reduction for employees making more than \$35,000 a year. This not only helps reduce the budget shortfall this year, but will also pay long term dividends by reducing our state's unfunded liabilities by \$155 million.	55,439,441
Multiple Activities		All Agencies	Central Travel Office	We propose establishing a Central Travel Office, which will put us in line with federal government and other state travel guidelines. This office will be responsible for the purchase of bulk airline travel and mandate that agencies do not exceed the newly established cap for hotel/motel purchases. The savings will be realized within each agency for the purchasing of cheaper airline tickets and the new limitation for reimbursement in lodging.	5,977,985

Multiple Activities		Multiple Agencies	Nightly Custodial Services	The Facilities Management Office of the General Services Division currently provides daytime custodial services five days a week for most buildings that it manages. The Facilities Management Office reports that it would be more efficient and cost effective to clean offices at night when they are not occupied, resulting in first year cost savings of \$988,357. These savings were also proposed by the GEAR Report in Recommendation #12.	1,000,000
Multiple Activities		Budget and Control Board	Procurement Office - Waive Fee	During the Agency Budget Summit in October of 2008, many agency heads requested that the Procurement Office at the Budget and Control Board waive the MMO and ITMO fees during FY 2009-10. We believe it is wise to suspend the MMO and ITMO fees during FY 2011-12 as well.	1,098,240
Multiple Activities		All Agencies	EIP-State Health Plan	GEAR Commission Recommendation #55 encourages State Health Plan members to fill routine prescription maintenance-drugs through mail-order pharmacies. Since it is less costly to fill prescriptions via mail order than in a retail setting, there are greater discounts on prescription drugs for the state and the plan members. If a member chooses to continue to purchase prescription maintenance-drugs from a retail pharmacy, then we recommend requiring the member to pay 50 percent of the drug cost after the third refill. According to the state's Pharmacy Benefits Manager, our state health plan uses mail orders for maintenance drugs less frequently than programs in other states.	4,896,244
Multiple Activities		Multiple Agencies	Reduce SCEIS Operating Funds	The South Carolina Enterprise Information System (SCEIS) is business process system for state agencies and will replace a number of existing operations and programs. Funding for the operation of SCEIS is provided by direct appropriation to the state Chief Information Officer (CIO). Once SCEIS comes online, all of these old systems will be turned off, and almost all of the functions will be assumed by the CIO. Once SCEIS applications come online, existing appropriations for replaced applications should be returned to the state treasury. Agencies are coming online intermittently, and this line reflects savings of over \$17 million.	16,383,388
Multiple Activities		Multiple Agencies	Consolidate Columbia Maintenance Facilities	Recommendation # 8 from the GEAR Report suggests consolidating the seven repair facilities located in Columbia into no more than three. Implementing this recommendation will produce cost savings of \$360,000 million in FY 2011-2012.	360,000
Multiple Activities		All Agencies	5-day/30 Day Fleet Bid Structure	Currently, the state bid calls for payment within thirty days of delivery. However, in the private sector, a dealer is required to pay off his floor plan source within five days of delivery or that dealer will be "out of trust." Moreover, floor plan interest charges are significant, especially if allowed to run for the full thirty days allowed for payment. As the average floor plan cost is \$200 per vehicle, a dealer, knowing that he can be paid in a timely manner, can lower his bid by thirty days of floor plan expense. Therefore, we recommend modifying the state bid structure to provide for two bid prices: one for payment within five days of delivery and one for payment within thirty days of delivery. We estimate that the 5-day payment will occur with half of the vehicles purchased equals an annual savings of \$200,000.	200,000
Multiple Activities		All Agencies	State Fleet Management	We suggest adopting Recommendations #4 from the GEAR Report, which suggests that vehicle acquisition bids should be revised to ensure lowest price-including rebates throughout the year. This change will attract more bids and allow the state to benefit from competition. Implementation of GEAR Recommendations #4 will produce first-year savings of \$200,000.	2,000,000
Multiple Activities		All Agencies	Travel - 15% Reduction	We recommend a 15% reduction in travel budgets for all agencies. Some of this funding could be recouped if the General Assembly would consider adjusting the gas per diem, which was raised to 50.5 cents/mile in 2008 when gas prices were roughly \$3.79/gallon. The current per diem rate remains at 50.5 cents/mile, even though gas is averaging \$2.49/gallon in South Carolina.	821,996
Multiple Activities		State Agencies and Universities	Lobbyists	We have long advocated eliminating taxpayer-funded lobbying. Twenty-eight state agencies and higher education institutions employ registered lobbyists, paying them not only lobbying fees, but also among the highest state salaries within their respective agencies. This unfortunate arrangement has helped spur the astronomical growth in state spending in recent years, forcing more difficult cuts in tough budget years. By eliminating funding for agency lobbyists, we can realize immediate savings from lobbying fees, Columbia office space, and lobbyist salaries, but more importantly, we can realize future savings when state spending decisions are based on merit—not on which agencies hire the best lobbyists.	1,264,567

Multiple Activities		All Agencies	Insurance Reserve Fund	As a result of implementing the GEAR committee's Recommendation #15, the Insurance Reserve Fund (IRF) opened the bidding for the property reinsurance broker contract to private brokers, which saved the state \$2.1 million. The new broker was able to obtain reinsurance on the secondary market, which saved an additional \$1.7 million. While we applaud the IRF for implementing this recommendation, these savings should be passed on to state agencies, which the IRF has not done to date.	3,741,248
Multiple Activities		All agencies	Cell Phone/Pager use	In June 2008, the LAC issued a report of state agency usage of cell phones and other wireless communication devices. This report found state agencies spent over \$7 million on cell phones, \$790,000 on pagers, and \$68,000 on satellite phones in FY 2005-06. Unfortunately, many agencies waste thousands per year on cell phones and other devices because the agencies' policies are inefficient or because the agencies fail to adequately monitor employees' usage. The LAC made recommendations that will reduce the state's total expenditures on cell phones and other devices. We recommend implementing the LAC report's recommendations, which will result in cost savings of \$751,410.	751,410
				Cost Savings Subtotal	104,302,657
<b>Making Tough Choices - Below the Line Savings</b>					
1435	S60	Procurement Review Panel	Administration	In order to streamline administrative procedure functions, eliminate duplication of effort, and provide further coordination of resources, we recommend transferring the authority and responsibilities of the Procurement Review Panel to the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Division. The Procurement Review Panel receives a limited number of protests each year—only 11 in the last two years—and the ALJ Division can easily assume these functions.	23,512
1436	S60	Procurement Review Panel	Hearings	In order to streamline administrative procedure functions, eliminate duplication of effort, and provide further coordination of resources, we recommend transferring the authority and responsibilities of the Procurement Review Panel to the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Division. The Procurement Review Panel receives a limited number of protests each year—only 11 in the last two years—and the ALJ Division can easily assume these functions.	87,500
				Below the Line Savings Subtotal	111,012
				Total Goal Area Savings	104,413,669
				Total Cost Savings	203,724,361
				Total Below the Line Savings	61,514,704
				Total FY 2010-11 Executive Budget Savings	265,239,065

# Education Lottery Budget

## EDUCATION LOTTERY BUDGET

For Fiscal Years FY 2007-08 Through FY 2011-12 Executive Budget

	<u>FY 2007-08</u>	<u>FY 2008-09</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<b>Executive Budget FY 2011-12</b>
<b><u>Revenue Estimates</u></b>					
BEA Revenue Estimate FY 2001-02					
BEA Revenue Estimate	244,000,000	244,000,000	244,000,000	244,816,300	240,000,000
BEA Interest Estimate	3,500,000	3,400,000	2,600,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
BEA FY 2004-05 Interest Earnings Estimate					
DAODAS Remittance					
BEA Unclaimed Prize Estimate	8,400,000	8,400,000	8,400,000	8,400,000	12,400,000
Estimated Carry Forward from Previous Fiscal Year	10,500,000				
FY 2007-08 Surplus Cash		4,922,729			
Limit Advertising to One-Half of 1% of Sales					4,121,200
Additional Transfer from the Education Lottery Commission					
Limit Retailer Commission to 6% of Sales					9,740,000
Unclaimed Prizes					
Total South Carolina Education Lottery Revenue	266,400,000	260,722,729	255,000,000		268,761,200

<b><u>Appropriations</u></b>					
CHE - Tuition Assistance Two-Year Institutions	47,000,000	47,000,000	47,000,000	47,000,000	47,000,000
CHE - LIFE Scholarships	62,604,207	85,256,682	85,256,682	87,370,916	92,880,602
CHE - HOPE Scholarships	7,767,606	8,076,110	7,823,474	7,823,474	8,066,590
CHE - Palmetto Fellows Scholarships	28,915,490	30,277,240	30,277,240	30,277,240	36,355,551
CHE - Need-Based Grants	11,631,566	11,631,566	11,631,566	11,631,566	12,845,353
CHE - Administration	-	-	-	-	-
CHE - National Guard Tuition Repayment Program	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
CHE - Endowed Chairs	30,000,000	-	-	-	-
CHE - Higher Education Excellence Enhance. Program	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
CHE - S. C. Alliance for Minority Participation	-	-	-	-	-
CHE - African American Loan Program	-	-	-	-	-
USC - African American Professors Program	-	-	-	-	-
Technology: Public 4-Year Univ, 2-Year Inst., & Tech Coll.	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,852,636	4,154,702	4,154,702
Teacher Grants	-	-	-	-	-
Tuition Grants Commission - Tuition Grants	7,766,604	7,766,604	7,766,604	7,766,604	7,766,604
Private Historically Black Colleges	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina State Univ. - Research & Technology Grant	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina State University	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
SDE - K-5 Reading, Math, Science, & Social Studies Prog	47,614,527	47,614,527	41,891,798	41,891,798	37,891,798
SDE - 6-8 Reading, Math, Science, & Social Studies Prog	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
SDE - Adult Education General Educational Development (GED)					
School for Deaf & Blind - Technology Replacement	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
State Library - Aid to County Libraries	-	-	-	-	-

## EDUCATION LOTTERY BUDGET

For Fiscal Years FY 2007-08 Through FY 2011-12 Executive Budget

	<u>FY 2007-08</u>	<u>FY 2008-09</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center;"><b>Executive Budget FY 2011-12</b></div>
SDE - Education Accountability Act:	-	-	-		
EAA - Homework Centers	-	-	-		
EAA - Teacher/Principal Specialist	-	-	-		
EAA - Teacher Specialist	-	-	-		
EAA - Principal Specialist	-	-	-		
EAA - Pilot Programs	-	-	-		
EAA - External Review Teams	-	-	-		
EAA - Retraining Grants	-	-	-		
EAA - Palmetto Gold/Silver Awards	-	-	-		
School Buses	-	-	-		
High Schools that Work	-	-	-		
Testing	-	-	-		
Student Identifier	-	-	-		
Data Collection	-	-	-		
Report Cards	-	-	-		
Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities	-	-	-		
ETV Digitalization	-	-	-		
ETV	-	-	-		
DAODAS	-	-	-		
Unclaimed Prizes - DAODAS	-	-	-		
Unclaimed Prizes - School Buses	-	-	-		
Unclaimed Prizes - Textbooks	-	-	-		
Unclaimed Prizes - Higher Educ. Excellence Enhance.	-	-	-		
Unclaimed Prizes - SDE - K-5 Reading, Math, Science and Social Studies	-	-	5,722,729	5,722,729	9,722,729
Unclaimed Prizes - SDE - First Steps	-	-	-		
Unclaimed Prizes - CHE - University Center	-	-	-		
Unclaimed Prizes - CHE - Tech. Public 4 & 2 Year Inst.	8,400,000	8,400,000	2,677,271	2,677,271	2,677,271
Unclaimed Prizes - CHE - State Electronic Library	-	-	-		
Total South Carolina Education Lottery Appropriations	<u>266,400,000</u>	<u>260,722,729</u>	<u>255,000,000</u>	<u>255,716,300</u>	<u>268,761,200</u>
Balance	-	-	-		-

# EIA Budget

## **EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT**

### **FY 2010-11 BEA Estimate (11/10/10)**

	<b><u>FY 2010-11</u></b>
EIA Sales Tax Revenues	561,398,984
EIA Interest Earnings	<u>2,100,000</u>
Total Estimated Revenues	563,498,984
Less: FY 2010-2011 Beginning Base	522,234,107
"New" EIA Recurring Revenue	<u>\$ 41,264,877</u>

### **Adjustments to Appropriated Base**

National Board Certification (NBC)	21,881,405
School Transportation	11,000,000
Instructional Materials	<u>8,383,472</u>
Total	<u>\$ 41,264,877</u>
Balance	<u><u>\$ -</u></u>




South Carolina Budget and  
Control Board – Office of State  
Budget – Executive Budget  
Certification Letter

MARK SANFORD, CHAIRMAN  
GOVERNOR

CONVERSE A. CHELLIS, III, CPA  
STATE TREASURER

RICHARD ECKSTROM, CPA  
COMPTROLLER GENERAL



SC BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD

OFFICE OF STATE BUDGET  
LES BOLES  
DIRECTOR

(803) 734-2280  
FAX: (803) 734-6645

HUGH K. LEATHERMAN, SR.  
CHAIRMAN, SENATE FINANCE  
COMMITTEE

DANIEL T. COOPER  
CHAIRMAN, HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS  
COMMITTEE

FRANK W. FUSCO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

December 31, 2010

The Honorable Mark Sanford  
Governor, State of South Carolina  
The State House  
Columbia, South Carolina

Dear Governor Sanford:

The purpose of this letter is to certify that the proposed FY 2011-12 Executive Budget is in balance as follows:

General Fund Revenue per Section 88	<u>\$5,369,478,345</u>
Appropriation of General Fund Expenditures	<u>5,369,478,345</u>
Balance	\$ <u>-0-</u>

Sincerely,

Les Boles

LB:ba

Note: An additional \$7,887,460 of documentary stamp tax revenue is transferred to the Conservation Land Bank per statute and is not included in general fund revenues.

Per the requirements of Section 1-11-425 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, a total of 40 copies of this public document were printed by the Print Shop of the Department of Corrections at a cost of \$289.60 or \$7.24 per copy and 304 copies of this public document were converted to electronic media by Another Printer, Inc. at a cost of \$1156.30 or \$3.80 per copy, for a grand total of \$1445.90.